REPORT RESUMES

ED 018 217 JC 680 100

IN SEARCH OF LEADERS.

BY- SMITH, G. KERRY, ED. AND OTHERS

AMERICAN ASSN. FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, WASH., D.C.

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$1.25 HC NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS. 296P.

DESCRIPTORS- *HIGHER EDUCATION, JUNIOR COLLEGES, COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES, *COLLEGE ROLE, *LEADERSHIP, *LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITY, LEADERSHIP TRAINING, EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY,

THE ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE NATION'S SEARCH FOR LEADERS IS EXAMINED IN THIS SERIES OF 52 PAPERS, WHICH DEAL WITH LEADERSHIP BOTH IN AND OUT OF THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION. TOPICS ARE GROUPED IN SEVEN UNITS--(1) THE QUEST FOR MORALITY, (2) ENLARGED RESPONSIBILITY, (3) APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP, (4) BROADER VISIONS OF LEADERSHIP, (5) STUDENT POTENTIAL, (6) SPECIFIC AREAS OF LEADERSHIP, AND (7) JOINING FORCES. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE AS STOCK NUMBER 255-08282 FOR $5.00 FROM AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, NW, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036. (WO)

ERIC

ED018217

AAHE

IN SEARCH OF LEADERS

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

JC 680 100

The American Association for Higher Education (formerly the Association for Higher Education) is a self-governing department of the National Education Association organized to serve individuals concerned with promoting the cause of higher education in the United States and overseas. As the only national educational organization open to faculty members and administrators alike—without regard to rank, discipline, or type or size of institution—AAHE is dedicated to the professional development of college and university educators and to the achievement of their educational objectives. It functions as a continuing forum for the growing expression of ideas relating to higher education and public policy. Its growing membership constitutes a representative cross-section of the American academic community.

Through a wide variety of projects, activities, and publications, including the annual National Conference on Higher Education, AAHE's program is directed toward such goals as improving college teaching; bettering conditions of professional work; building relationships among faculty members, students, administrators, and trustees; stimulating curricular innovation; advancing educational research; expanding educational opportunities; developing educational technology; influencing national higher education policies; and informing its members, and the general public, about current issues and problems in higher education.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

IN SEARCH OF LEADERS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 23 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

CURRENT ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION • 1967

IN SEARCH OF LEADERS

Editor
G. KERRY SMITH

Associate Editor
TOM ERHARD

Assistant Editor
CAROL MacGUINEAS

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED
MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY National Education Association
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER
AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION.
FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM
REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright © 1967 by

The National Education Association of the United States

$5.00 per copy—Stock Number 255-08282

Discount on quantity orders
(Postage will be charged on all orders not accompanied by remittance)
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 48-1458

Foreword

The search for leadership can never end in a democracy such as ours. At a time when technology offers previously unheard-of opportunities and simultaneously threatens to strip man of his accustomed ways, the need for new leadership in all areas of American life has become desperate. On every hand—in industry, government, labor, and the professions—the cry these days is the same: we need new men with fresh ideas, educated minds capable of analyzing and resolving incredibly complex problems in a manner that both safeguards private rights and protects public interests.

Such leadership must come from our colleges and universities. They are the institutions where old values and new theories are put to the tests of study, inquiry, and debate. They serve as seedbeds of social change and as fountainheads of conservatism. They are unique reservoirs of talented human beings. Some campuses may mirror the tensions and issues of the moment; others may try to transcend them. But however they approach their commitments to instruct the young, advance the search for truth, and serve the common good, all institutions of higher education are involved constantly in the search for leaders.

The essays in this volume were prepared by educators mindful of the imperatives and difficulties of discovering and nurturing leadership today. Their perceptions of how colleges and universities can best help the nation in search of leaders give the professional reader new insights into familiar questions and the layman a better sense of the vast scope and many functions of the academic enterprise. In presenting these papers selected and edited from among those presented at its 22nd National Conference on Higher Education, March 5-8, 1967, the American Association for Higher Education hopes, by letting distinguished educators present their own views,to broaden the discussion centering on the need for leadership in our society and to highlight the role colleges and universities must play in meeting that need.

G. KERRY SMITH

Contents

PART I · THE QUEST FOR MORALITY

The Missing Element: Moral Courage 3 Barabara W. Tuchman
On Filling a Role and on Being a Man: Leadership for Improved Conditions for Learning and Research 10 Nevitt Sanford
Redefining the Ethics of Academia 21 Henry T. Yost, Jr.

PART II · ENLARGED RESPONSIBILITY

California Higher Education: A Report from the Underground 29 Jesse M. Unruh
Leadership and Change in Higher Education 35 Douglass Cater
Higher Educational Leadership in Developing Federal Policies 41 Stephen K. Bailey
How Can a Legislator Become an Educational Leader? 46 Albert H. Quie

PART III · APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP

Dynamics of Leadership 55 Jack R. Gibb
Entrepreneurs, Mark II 67 Harold J. Leavitt
Effective Models of University Governance 78 Algo D. Henderson
Autocracy Versus Democracy in Top Administration 83 John W. McConnell
The Innovator and the Establishment 88 Edgar Dale
Growing New Leaders 92 Conrad Hilberry
Planning as a Continuing Leadership Process 96 Ronald Lippitt
Acceptance of Major Curricular Changes 101 Miller Upton
New Degrees for College Teachers 106 Stephen H. Spurr
Planning for Better Learning 110 Samuel N. Postlethwait

Alternatives to “Up or Out” 114 Charles E. Stearns
Why Evaluate? 118 Louis Long

PART IV · BROADER VISIONS OF LEADERSHIP

Leadership in a Time of Educational Change 125 Samuel B. Gould
The Policy-Making Role of Trustees in Church-Related Colleges 135 Alfred D. Donovan
The Policy-Making Role of Trustees in Church-Related Colleges 139 Paul H. Sherry
Faculty Recruitment and Orientation in Four-Year Colleges and Universities 144 Frederic W. Ness
The Good Place or No Place: Communication on the Campus 148 Robert S. Fogarty
Frisky Horses and Frisky Trustees 153 Robert Menke
Church-Related Colleges: Where Next? 158 Manning M. Pattillo
Where Next: The Future of Catholic Higher Education 162 Charles E. Ford
Expanding Opportunities in International Education 166 Paul A. Miller

PART V · STUDENT POTENTIAL

Student Participation in Academic Governance 173 Warren Bryan Martin
On Student-Initiated Courses: Some Reflections 178 Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr.
Student Participation in Effective Programs of Faculty Evaluation 182 Philip R. Werdell
Training Student Leaders 186 E. G. Williamson
Finding and Developing Student Leaders: New Needs and an Old Despair 189 Roland Liebert
The Student Views the College Administrator 195 Edward D. Eddy

PART VI · SPECIFIC AREAS OF LEADERSHIP

The Peace Corps Challenge to Higher Education 201 Robert W. Iversen
Higher Education as a Leader in the Urban Setting 207 John E. Bebout
The Public Control of Public Universities 211 Ralph D. Hetzel
Higher Education and the University-Sponsored Experimental College 215 Adolph G. Anderson
Continuing Education for Women: A Growing Challenge 218 Mary Dublin Keyserling
The Junior College: What Next? 223 James W. Reynolds
Unique Problems of Junior Colleges 227 Roger H. Garrison
Faculty Development Programs 232 Russell M. Cooper
The Faculty Senate and Educational Policy-Making 236 Forest G. Hill
The Departmental Chairman 240 David Fellman
Departmental Leadership in the Two-Year College 244 Richard C. Richardson, Jr.
Recruitment of Faculty for the Community and Junior Colleges 249 Clifford G. Erickson
The Computer and Instructional Technology 253 Launor F. Carter

PART VII · JOINING FORCES

Leadership: Organization and Structure 263 Martin Tarcher
Interinstitutional Cooperation 272 Raymond S. Moore
Opportunities and Problems for Leadership Through Local and Regional Consortia 277 Elmer D. West
Interinstitutional Cooperation and the Exchange of Instructional Materials 281 Ernest L. Boyer
Containing the Information Explosion 286 Harold A. Haswell

PART I

THE QUEST FOR MORALITY

PART
I
CHAPTER
1

The missing element: moral courage

BARBARA W. TUCHMAN

WHAT I WANT TO SAY is concerned less with leadership than with its absence, that is, with the evasion of leadership. Not in the physical sense, for we have, if anything, a superabundance of leaders—hundreds of Pied Pipers, or would-be Pied Pipers, running about, ready and anxious to lead the population. They are scurrying around, collecting consensus, gathering as wide an acceptance as possible. But what they are *not* doing, very notably, is standing still and saying, "*This* is what I believe. This I will do and that I will not do. This is my code of behavior and that is outside it. This is excellent and that is trash." There is an abdication of moral leadership in the sense of a general unwillingness to state standards.

Of all the ills that our poor criticized, analyzed, sociologized society is heir to, the focal one, it seems to me, from which so much of our uneasiness and confusion derive is the absence of standards. We are too unsure of ourselves to assert them, to stick by them, or if necessary, in the case of persons who occupy positions of authority, to impose them. We seem to be afflicted by a widespread and eroding reluctance to take any stand on any values, moral, behavioral, or aesthetic.

Everyone is afraid to call anything wrong, or vulgar, or fraudulent, or just bad taste or bad manners. Congress, for example, pussyfooted for months (following years of apathy) before taking action on a member convicted by the courts of illegalities; and when they finally got around to unseating him, one suspects they did it for the wrong motives. In 1922, in England, a man called Horatio Bottomley, a rather flamboyant character and popular demagogue—very similar in type, by the way, to Adam Clayton Powell, with similarly elastic financial ethics—who founded a paper called *John Bull* and got himself elected to Parliament, was found guilty of misappropriating the funds which his readers subscribed to victory bonds and other causes promoted by his paper. The day after the verdict, he was expelled from the House of Commons, with no fuss and very little debate, except for a few friendly farewells, as he was rather an engaging fellow. But no member thought the House had any other course to consider: out he went. I do not suggest that this represents a difference between British and American morality; the difference is in the *times*.

Our time is one of disillusion in our species and a resulting lack of self-confidence—for good historical reasons. Man's recent record has not been reassuring. After engaging in the Great War with all its mud and blood and ravaged ground, its disease, destruction, and death, we allowed ourselves a bare twenty years before going at it all over again. And the second time was accompanied by an episode of man's inhumanity to man of such enormity that its implications for all of us have not yet, I think, been fully measured. A historian has recently stated that for such a phenomenon as the planned and nearly accomplished extermination of a people to take place, one of three preconditions necessary was public indifference.

Since then the human species has been busy overbreeding, polluting the air, destroying the balance of nature, and bungling in a variety of directions so that it is no wonder we have begun to doubt man's capacity for good judgment. It is hardly surprising that the self-confidence of the nineteenth century and its belief in human progress has been dissipated. "Every great civilization," said Secretary Gardner last year, "has been characterized by confidence in itself." At mid-twentieth century, the supply is low. As a result, we tend to shy away from all judgments. We hesitate to label anything wrong, and therefore hesitate to require the individual to bear moral responsibility for his acts.

We have become afraid to fix blame. Murderers and rapists and muggers and persons who beat up old men and engage in other forms of assault are not guilty; society is guilty; society has wronged them; society beats its breast and says *mea culpa*—it is our fault, not the wrongdoer's. The wrongdoer, poor fellow, could not help himself.

I find this very puzzling because I always ask myself, in these cases, what about the many neighbors of the wrongdoer, equally poor, equally disadvantaged, equally sufferers from society's neglect, who nevertheless maintain certain standards of social behavior, who do *not* commit crimes, who do not murder for money or rape for kicks. How does it happen that they know the difference between right and wrong, and how long will they abide by the difference if the leaders and opinion-makers and pacesetters continue to shy away from bringing home responsibility to the delinquent?

Admittedly, the reluctance to condemn stems partly from a worthy instinct—*tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner*—and from a rejection of what was often the hypocrisy of Victorian moral standards. True, there was a large component of hypocrisy in nineteenth-century morality. Since the advent of Freud, we know more, we understand more about human behavior, we are more reluctant to cast the first stone—to condemn—which is a good thing; but the pendulum has swung to the point where we are now afraid to place moral responsibility at all. Society, that large amorphous, nonspecific scapegoat, must carry the burden for each of us, relieving us of guilt. We have become so indoctrinated by the terrors lurking in the dark corridors of the guilt complex that guilt has acquired a very bad name. Yet a little guilt is not a dangerous thing; it has a certain social utility.

When it comes to guilt, a respected writer—respected in some circles—has told us, as her considered verdict on the Nazi program, that evil is banal—a word that means something so ordinary that you are not bothered by it; the dictionary definition is "commonplace and hackneyed." Somehow that conclusion does not seem adequate or even apt. *Of course,* evil is commonplace; *of course* we all partake of it. Does that mean that we must withhold disapproval, and that when evil appears in dangerous degree or vicious form we must not condemn but only understand? That may be very Christian in intent, but in reality it is an escape from the necessity of exercising judgment—which exercise, I believe, is a prime function of leadership.

What it requires is courage—just a little, not very much—the courage to be independent and stand up for the standard of values one believes in. That kind of courage is the quality most conspicuously missing, I think, in current life. I don't mean the courage to protest and walk around with picket signs or boo Secretary McNamara which, though it may stem from the right instinct, is a group thing that does not require any very stout spirit. I did it myself for Sacco and Vanzetti when I was about twelve and picketed in some now forgotten labor dispute when I was a freshman and even got arrested. There is nothing to that; if you don't do that sort of thing when you are eighteen, then there is something wrong with you. I mean, rather, a kind of lonely moral courage, the quality that attracted me to that odd character, Czar Reed, and to Lord Salisbury, neither of whom cared a rap for the opinion of the public or would have altered his conduct a hair to adapt to it. It is the quality someone said of Lord Palmerston was his "you-be-damnedness." That is the mood we need a little more of.

Standards of taste, as well as morality, need continued reaffirmation to stay alive, as liberty needs eternal vigilance. To recognize and to proclaim the difference between the good and the shoddy, the true and the fake, as well as between right and wrong, or what we believe at a given time to be right and wrong, is the obligation, I think, of persons who presume to lead, or are thrust into leadership, or hold positions of authority. That includes—whether they asked for it or not—all educators and even, I regret to say, writers.

For educators it has become increasingly the habit in the difficult circumstances of college administration today to find out what the students want in the matter of curriculum and deportment and then give it to them. This seems to me another form of abdication, another example of the prevailing reluctance to state a standard and expect, not to say require, performance in accord with it. The permissiveness, the yielding of decision to the student, does not—from what I can tell—promote responsibility in the young so much as uneasiness and a kind of anger at *not* being told what is expected of them, a resentment of their elders' unwillingness to take a position. Recently a student psychiatric patient of the Harvard Health Services was quoted by the director, Dr. Dana Farnsworth, as complaining, "My parents never tell me what to do. They never stop me from doing anything." That is the unheard wail, I think, extended beyond parents to the general absence of a guiding, reassuring pattern, which is behind much of society's current uneasiness.

It is human nature to want patterns and standards and a structure of behavior. A pattern to conform to is a kind of shelter. You see it in kindergarten and primary school, at least in those schools where the children when leaving the classroom are required to fall into line. When the teacher gives the signal, they fall in with alacrity; they know where they belong and they instinctively like to *be* where they belong. They like the feeling of being in line.

Most people need a structure, not only to fall into but to fall out of. The rebel with a cause is better off than the one without. At least he knows what he is "agin." He is not lost. He does not suffer from an identity crisis. It occurs to me that much of the student protest now may be a testing of authority, a search for that line to fall out of, and when it isn't there students become angrier because they feel more lost, more abandoned than ever. In the late turmoil at Berkeley, at least as regards the filthy speech demonstration, there was a missed opportunity, I think (however great my respect for Clark Kerr) for a hearty, emphatic, and unmistakable "No!" backed up by sanctions. Why? Because the act, even if intended as a demonstration of principle, was in this case, like any indecent exposure, simply offensive, and what is offensive to the greater part of society is anti-social, and what is anti-social, so long as we live in social groups and not each of us on his own island, must be curtailed, like Peeping Toms or obscene telephone calls, as a public nuisance. The issue is really not complicated or difficult but, if we would only look at it with more self-confidence, quite simple.

So, it seems to me, is the problem of the CIA. You will say that in this case people have taken a stand, opinion-makers have worked themselves into a moral frenzy. Indeed they have, but over a false issue. The CIA is not, after all, the Viet Cong or the Schutzstaffel in blackshirts. Its initials do not stand for Criminal Indiscretions of America. It is an arm of the American government, our elected, representative government (whatever may be one's feelings toward that body at the moment). Virtually every government in the world subsidizes youth groups, especially in their international relations, not to mention in athletic competitions. (I do not know if the CIA is subsidizing our Equestrian Team, but I know personally a number of people who would be only too delighted if it were.) The difficulty here is simply that the support was clandestine in the first place and not the proper job of the CIA in the second. An intelligence agency should be restricted to the gathering of intelligence and not extend itself into operations. In armies the two functions are distinct: intelligence is G2 and operations is G3. If our government could manage its functions with a little more precision and perform openly those functions that are perfectly respectable, there would be no issue. The recent excitement only shows how easily we succumb, when reliable patterns or codes of conduct are absent, to a confusion of values.

A similar confusion exists, I think, with regard to the omnipresent pornography that surrounds us like smog. A year ago the organization of my own profession, the Authors League, filed a brief *amicus curiae* in the appeal of Ralph Ginzburg, the publisher of a periodical called *Eros* and other items, who had been convicted of disseminating obscenity through the mails. The League's action was taken on the issue of censorship to which all good liberals automatically respond like Pavlov's dogs. Since at this stage in our culture pornography has so far gotten the upper hand that to do battle in its behalf against the dragon Censorship is rather like doing battle today against the bustle in behalf of short skirts, and since I believe that the proliferation of pornography in its sadistic forms is a greater social danger at the moment than censorship, and since Mr. Ginzburg was not an author anyway but a commercial promoter, I raised an objection, as a member of the Council, to the Authors League's spending its funds in the Ginzburg case. I was, of course, outvoted; in fact, there was no vote. Everyone around the table just sat and looked at me in cold disapproval. Later, after my objection was printed in the *Bulletin*, at my request, two distinguished authors wrote privately to me to express their agreement but did not go so far as to say so publicly.

Thereafter, when the Supreme Court upheld Mr. Ginzburg's conviction, everyone in the intellectual community raised a hullaballoo about censorship advancing upon us like some sort of Frankenstein's monster. This seems to me another case of getting excited about the wrong thing. The cause of pornography is *not* the same as the cause of free speech. There *is* a difference. Ralph Ginzburg is *not* Theodore Dreiser and this is not the 1920's. If one looks around at the movies, especially the movie advertisements, and the novels and the pulp magazines glorifying perversion and the paperbacks that make de Sade available to school children, one does not get the impression that in the 1960's we are being stifled in the Puritan grip of Anthony Comstock. Here again, leaders—in this case authors and critics—seem too unsure of values or too afraid of being unpopular to stand up and assert the perfectly obvious difference between smut and free speech, or to say "Such and such is offensive and can be harmful." Happily, there are signs of awakening. In a *Times* review of a book called *On Iniquity* by Pamela Hansford Johnson, which related pornography to the Moors murders in England, the reviewer concluded that "this may be the opening of a discussion that must come, the opening shot."

In the realm of art, no less important than morals, the abdication of judgment is almost a disease. Last fall when the Lincoln Center opened its glittering new opera house with a glittering new opera on the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra, the curtain rose on a gaudy crowd engaged in energetic revels around a gold box in the shape of a pyramid, up whose sides (conveniently fitted with toe-holds, I suppose) several sinuous and reasonably nude slave girls were chased by lecherous guards left over from "Aida." When these preliminaries quieted down, the front of the gold box suddenly dropped open, and guess who was inside? No, it was not Cleopatra, it was

Antony, looking, I thought, rather bewildered. What he was doing inside the box was never made clear. Thereafter everything happened—and in crescendos of gold and spangles and sequins, silks and gauzes, feathers, fans, jewels, brocades, and such a quantity of glitter that one began to laugh, thinking that the spectacle was intended as a parody of the old Shubert revue. But no, this was the Metropolitan Opera in the vaunted splendor of its most publicized opening since the Hippodrome. I gather it was Mr. Bing's idea of giving the first night customers a fine splash. What he achieved was simply vulgarity, as at least some reviewers had the courage to say next day. Now, I cannot believe that Mr. Bing and his colleagues do not know the difference between honest artistry in stage design and pretentious ostentation. If they know better, why do they allow themselves to do worse? As leaders in their field of endeavor, they should have been setting standards of beauty and creative design, not debasing them.

One finds the same peculiarities in the visual arts. Non-art, as its practitioners describe it—the blob school, the all-black canvasses, the paper cutouts and Campbell soup tins and plastic hamburgers and pieces of old carpet—is treated as art, not only by dealers whose motive is understandable (they have discovered that shock value sells); not only by a gullible pseudocultural section of the public who are not interested in art but in being "in" and wouldn't, to quote an old joke, know a Renoir from a Jaguar; but also, which I find mystifying, by the museums and the critics. I am sure they know the difference between the genuine and the hoax. But not trusting their own judgment, they seem afraid to say no to anything, for fear, I suppose, of making a mistake and turning down what may be next decade's Matisse.

For the museums to exhibit the plastic hamburgers and twists of scrap iron is one thing, but for them to *buy* them for their permanent collection puts an imprimatur on what is fraudulent. Museum curators, too, are leaders who have an obligation to distinguish—I will not say the good from the bad in art because that is an elusive and subjective matter dependent on the eye of the time—but at least honest expression from phony. Most of what fills the galleries on Madison Avenue is simply stuff designed to take advantage of current fads and does not come from an artist's vision or an honest creative impulse. The dealers know it; the critics know it; the purveyors themselves know it; the public suspects it; but no one dares say it because that would be committing oneself to a standard of values and even, heaven forbid, exposing oneself to being called square.

In the fairy story, it required a child to cry out that the Emperor was naked. Let us not leave that task to the children. It should be the task of leaders to recognize and state the truth as they see it. It is their task not to be afraid of absolutes.

If the educated man is not willing to express standards, if he cannot show that he has them and applies them, what then is education for? Its purpose, I take it, is to form the civilized man, whom I would define as the person capable of the informed exercise of judgment, taste, and values. If at maturity he is not willing to express judgment on matters of policy or taste or morals, if at fifty he does not believe that he has acquired more wisdom and informed experience than is possessed by the student at twenty, then he is saying in effect that education has been a failure.

On filling a role and on being a man: leadership for improved conditions for learning and research

PART
I
CHAPTER
2

NEVITT SANFORD

ONLY A FEW YEARS AGO, in *The American College* (1960), I expressed the hope that public criticism of our colleges might induce the scholars and research men who run them to institute some reforms. It never occurred to me then that students would soon organize protests against the kind of education they were receiving, or that leading citizens would join the academic establishment in support of the old ways of doing things. What is most depressing about the statements of politicians and the irate letters to the editor that have followed student demonstrations is not their conservatism or their impatience with the younger generation, but the narrow way they conceive of education. In the minds of many citizens, getting an education seems to be a matter of acquiring units of information, which is measured by the number of hours spent in the classroom. There is seldom a suggestion that college might help change the individual himself, broaden his horizons, liberate him from dogma and prejudice, or give him a new sense of identity. These changes do occur, however, especially where education is seen as a total experience, embracing not only courses and examinations but also opportunities for students to try various styles of life, to learn from each other, to have their unexamined belief systems challenged, and above all, to have associations with men who show in their lives the values of liberal education.

The prevalence of the narrow view of education is a reminder of how long teaching has been neglected in our institutions of higher learning, of how dominant and enduring are the academic structures of disciplines and courses that were designed less for teaching than for the production of knowledge. It is ironic that leading citizens should share the prevailing purely academic view of education when they have nothing to gain by it and when it stands in opposition to many of their own values and aspirations. Ask a state legislator, for example, in serious discussion what *he* got out of college, and the changes are good that after wryly commenting that he would not have gotten in by present admission standards, he will recall a relationship with a professor, or something that he learned from his roommates and friends, or an experience on the athletic field, or his participation in the student protest of his day. Ask a leading citizen what he hopes college will do for his son or daughter beyond giving some preparation for a job, and he will mention personality qualities that he would like to see developed: independence of thinking, a sense of social responsibility, a capacity to judge people, the resourcefulness necessary to avoid boredom, and so on. This suggests that the great humanistic purpose of education, though suppressed or put aside, has not been forgotten in our society, and that a college able to restate this purpose and show by its actions a rededication to it would not only win the loyalty of its students, but also suffer no lack of constituents or supporters in the larger society.

I am not concerned with leadership in general or in the abstract, with personal qualities that would serve in diverse situations. I am not concerned with administration or management, or with those skills in human relations that can be acquired through special training programs. I am talking about leadership in education, and more particularly leadership in the kind of education we need today. I am looking for men who can lead me in the direction in which I want to go, and who can represent for students the best in our tradition, and who can state for the public the great humanistic purposes of education. In other words, I am looking at leadership from the point of view of the consumer.

The consumer, as I see it, needs not so much to have suitable arrangements made for him as he needs to be inspired, to be offered some vision of what he might become. For students, such leaders might be teachers as well as presidents or higher officers of the institution. Educators other than presidents may also speak to the public in the way that is needed. But for both of these groups, the president is still the key figure.

One might ask why we need leaders when we have bureaucracies. Bureaucracy is a bad word nowadays, but the fact remains that this kind of structure was a great invention and on the whole has served us well. It permits ordinary men to take crucial roles in organizations and to perform in ways that are adequate to keep things going.

We have defined roles for our leaders and we expect them to behave strictly according to the role requirements, not to express themselves as individuals. As organizations become larger and more complex, there are certain kinds of functions that must be performed by the person at the top. If he fails to perform them, confusion is likely to result. Hence we are troubled when we see a person in a position of authority behaving in a way that seems to be not in keeping with the demands of his role. This is evident in our attitude toward the President of the United States. We want him to be a great man, someone with whom we can identify ourselves, but we also like to be reassured that he is a real person with human qualities. We read that he prefers this kind of food or wears that kind of clothing. But if we get an inkling that his decisions as President are affected by his emotions or by his own special interests, then we become anxious or indignant.

It is no doubt more efficient in big organizations to have clearly specified role requirements for the leader and to hold him to them, but we pay for that efficiency by surrendering a possible source of information. In the large corporations, presidents are now changed without a ripple of disturbance in the lower echelons. The incoming president simply does what the outgoing one did, and life goes on.

If we cannot name many inspiring presidents of universities, it is simply another indication of the relative dearth of leadership throughout our society. Consider the foundations. Where are the great foundation men of yesteryear, men like Alan Gregg or Lawrence Frank, who pushed programs in which they were vitally interested, clearly identified themselves with projects, and personally took the risks involved? Talking to a foundation man today is something like petting a pony. He stands still and he cocks his ear, but that is about all you get in the way of a response. He must not show his hand or generate any false hopes, or at least not until he has talked with his consultants or found out what the other foundations are doing.

In general, the responsible individual is vanishing into a tangle of organized social roles and group memberships. Formerly we could identify and complain about leaders who were arrogant, misguided, or corrupt; but such men are increasingly veiled by the corporate image. Instead of good or bad decisions by responsible officials, we now have consensus of anonymous committees. We have corporate indifference or immorality. Vast networks of functions somehow lead to immoral effects, and we can find no individual to blame, no one who feels personally responsible for what happened.

On the national scene we seem to be in a crisis of confidence, a credibility gap, owing apparently to our continuing struggle with totalitarianism and our apparently inevitable tendency to imitate its methods. Time and again in recent years educated people have seen their heroes fall, lured into positions in which they were soon publicly advocating policies in which they did not believe. Probably on the national scene we have reached some kind of limit as far as lying is concerned. I used to tell myself, after some fresh incidence of governmental deception, that anyway we still had our capacity for indignation and that we had not become like the totalitarian countries; but recently when a friend returned from a few weeks' visit in the East to ask what was happening in our area, she having been discussing with everyone the Adam Clayton Powell case and the latest exposé concerning the CIA operations, I was suddenly struck with the mildness of our reactions to that CIA thing. Our reactions seemed to be that all these shenanigans were no more than was to be expected, and for anyone to express indignation would be to expose himself as naïve. I said that about the only thing that could create excitement in our neck of the woods would be the discovery of an honest man.

Actually, this is hardly a joking matter. We seem to be on the verge of general demoralization, and it is obvious that our students are the greatest sufferers. Failings in our large universities are mirrors of what is happening in the larger society. The results of increasing size and complexity of our colleges and universities are familiar. The more students there are, the more disconnected they tend to be from each other, from the faculties, and from the administration. Attending larger classes, students have less opportunity to deal with their teachers; and in dealing with the largely impersonal bureaucracies, they are taught to regard themselves less as people than as sets of responses to institutional requirements. Instead of getting to know an admired adult, they are dealt with by officers in charge of such functions as registration, counseling, teaching, and discipline—all according to a model adopted from business and the military. To the people who perform these functions, students appear less as individuals than as problems in areas handled by such officers. Conversely, the student is rarely able to deal with adults as individuals. Observing his busy professors in a variety of roles—as lecturers, committee members, and so forth—the student is struck most of all by their inconsistency.

Still another obvious complicating factor in the larger university is the enormous diversity of needs and interests that exist among the people within it and among those outside who expect something from it. The government is providing an increasingly large fraction of the university budget in support of research and of specialized training which it considers important. Life often appears to be every man for himself, with each department, institute, center, or agency focused on its own special interest. One is forced to ask where the general purposes of the whole institution are, and who is looking after them.

Let us agree that the university president's role is an extraordinarily complex and difficult one, and that it is becoming more so. There is a famous quote: "A man may be a president of a transcontinental railroad, an international banking corporation, a far-flung business, but the presidency of a great university is an impossible post." The post seems to have been nicely designed in the beginning for an educator with a philosophy of his own who could lay down conditions for accepting the post, win the support of his faculty, and push through a program. But the days of the strong president seem to be about over. Either of the president's major roles, appointee and voting member of the regents or chairman of the academic senate, would seem to be enough to dominate all but the strongest personality. The university president today seems to be enmeshed in a vast machinery. Decisions necessarily tend to be purely administrative or political.

All this is very familiar, but sometimes presidents seem a little too eager to believe it, or to count on the widespread belief that their role is indeed very, very difficult. They will tell you cheerfully that everyone hates them. Actually, I don't see many presidents who look as if they spent sleepless nights or were not eating well or were torn by moral conflict. The important thing is not whether one is hated, but why. It is one thing to be hated for slipperiness, another to be hated because one has taken a strong position in opposition to that of respected colleagues. Many decisions, of course, must be administrative and political. It is when the attempt is made to solve moral problems by administrative actions that trouble comes.

A few years ago I encountered an old friend who had sometime in the five years since I had seen him become dean of the graduate school at one of our great universities. In the old days he had been a kindred spirit. He was a professor of English who enjoyed the intellectual companionship of personality psychologists, psychoanalysts, and other deviate types. He had written articles that leaned heavily on psychoanalytic theories. But I soon realized in talking to him that my old friend had changed. It was shocking to hear him suggest that my kind of psychology was interesting and important but, alas, not scientific, and therefore not in good repute any more. This occurred at a time when the recurrent struggles between experimental and clinical psychologists were at a high point in his university, and I knew to whom he had been listening. I could see the handwriting on the wall for the clinical psychologists, although I knew they had been depending on this dean for moral support. But what I found most shocking was the fact that my old friend had allowed himself to become modified internally under the pressures of expediency. He wanted to have it appear that what was in fact a position of expediency was a position that he had taken up on intellectual grounds. I didn't believe it, and in consequence I have not been able to take seriously what he has had to say on any important subject since, for I no longer have any way of knowing when he is saying what is politic and when he is speaking from convictions that are truly his own.

One could make a compendium of manifestations of declining moral commitment on our campuses, of what students like to call expressions of bad faith, or of ways in which the credibility gap grows wider. There may be, of course, and there sometimes is, outright deception, as when an officer of a university told a group of student demonstrators that if they would stop demonstrating and go home there would be no arrests, when in fact a request for arrest had already been sent to the local police department. There was a case I heard of not long ago in which a group of students were encouraged by a dean to go ahead and work out a plan for the use of a facility that had recently become available, only to have the students discover later that a decision that the facility would be used by another group had already been made at the time they were put to work.

An official may speak to a group of students and be amazed that they don't believe him, forgetting that he didn't come quite clean with them two months ago and that his predecessor in the same office was a notorious prevaricator. It is common in dealing with students for officials not to give the real reasons for their action, but instead to give some legalistic reason when in fact their main aim is to avoid a public reaction. In general it is the tendency today to deal with students politically; that is to say, with more attention to possible public reactions than to the educational needs of the students themselves.

Not enough of our leaders stand up for education. If they did, they would point out that controversy on the campus and demonstrations by students have educational value. Instead, the public is told that there are only a few agitators around and that the university after all has a great many Nobel Prize winners. Hypocrisy with respect to such matters as sex and drinking is sort of the normal diet for students today. Administrators put off issues, keep professors and students dangling while they are conducting studies. This goes on more or less continually. Commonly, policy decisions are made not by any deliberate consideration, but by a succession of small housekeeping administrative matters. It is widely believed by educated people that universities will sell their souls to get money or to keep state legislators off their backs. We faculty can tolerate quite a bit of this, knowing something about the art of the possible, but even a suspicion of this is very hard on students.

And yet the emotional need for leadership persists. Just as on the national scene the President remains the vehicle for the hopes and aspirations of the people, despite his steadily decreasing freedom of movement, so with faculties, particularly in times of crisis: we need a sanctioned leader behind whom we can all rally. This was very apparent at Berkeley during the loyalty oath controversy. We kept hoping that the president would do something, long after our better judgment should have told us that it was asking the impossible. Our hopes went up or down as reports filtered out of the Regents' meetings that he had been strong, or had not stood up well. There were efforts to exempt him from the skulduggery that was frequently ascribed to the administration. In short, I think there was a widespread tendency among the faculty to project onto the president the role of the good father. The Regents, of course, had already pre-empted the role of bad father. I thought at the time that the president stood in some of our minds as a kind of mother figure, and that we might on this basis explain the persistent hope and belief that he could somehow intercede with the Regents, or take some sort of lead in the struggle for democratic rights. Consider this plea from a student who wrote recently in the *Stanford Daily:*

> The university has somehow become more a place for intellectuals to pursue their careers than a place to discuss truth, fundamentals, and help the world. There is no moral leadership here amid the minds that might be able to carry it off. Some individuals help, but they are few, far between, and controversial.
>
> Professors hide behind the claim that the university should not be dragged into the arena of present-day concerns. A detached view, an inner city is needed, to provide reason in an irrational world. But the world goes on, and while there is nothing to stop professors from banding together as individuals and forming some goals for Americans, somehow they don't bother.
>
> They are too busy or too afraid or too tied up in their own brand of wage-slavery or idea-slavery to do it. They are amoral, apathetic, and slothful. Please, professors, write angry letters and show how wrong this appraisal is. Tell us your profession is relevant to the social issues now before us. Tell us what kind of an America you want.

Is this student already alienated or merely about to become so? It has to be admitted, I think, that he may be open to the appeals of demagogues, as were the embattled professors at Berkeley. Yet there is a legitimacy to his claim and ours. We can't live, or at least we can't be fully human, without ideals and without some human embodiment of them. The British were probably wise in retaining a royal family in whom people could see the embodiment of whatever were the ideals of the time. We usually manage to bring down our established authorities, to bring them down to size, and then to make heroes of McCarthys and movie actors.

College and university presidents, no matter how large their institution, are bound to represent much of what students are supposed to become. As leaders of the whole enterprise, they must embody its aims and ideals, and cannot be merely the engineers that keep the machinery turning. Presidents may overlook their role as models for students, and it may appear at times when things are running smoothly that the students are overlooking it, too; but let the president make a mistake, violate some ethical norm, compromise once too often with the forces that oppose the true aims of the college or university, or display some measure of hypocrisy or phoniness, and the effect on the students is immediate and profound. They feel betrayed and lapse into cynicism or passivity. Strangely enough, a few years ago at Stanford a rumor got started that a well-known national political figure, who had recently been defeated in a campaign, was going to be the president at Stanford. Everybody was depressed for days.

Not even the president of a large, complex university can be just an administrator, mediator, politician, financier, or public relations man. He must be, first of all, a scholar or intellectual, and someone who knows or cares about education. Most important, I think, is that he should have a philosophy of education, preferably a humanistic one of the sort I suggested at the beginning. His first job, in my view, is to explain this philosophy of education to the public, and thus to reduce the warfare between that public and the students. It is ironic that the supporters of universities who really desire the kind of education I mentioned at the beginning are constantly sold on the point that their university is a great research organization and that that is what they are supposed to admire.

The president must, I think, stand for something, and he must reveal himself. Granting the virtues of quiet negotiation or quiet persuasion directed to the Texas oilmen and the trustees, the fact is that the president must come through occasionally. He must show his students that he really stands for something; and if it is dangerous to do so, so much the better. It has occurred to me from time to time that it might be a good thing if presidents were fired more often than they are, or if professors became the objects of public criticism rather than watching the students take the brunt all the time.

The president who is first of all an educator must first of all know his students. He must know them conceptually as well as personally, and when he does, he will not mind according them some political power. In fact, he will be happy to discover that he can use that power in some of his contests with the faculty, if not with the public. If he has such a philosophy of education, his job, his decision-making, will in fact be easier, because he will now have a basis on which to make judgments of priorities among the diverse conflicting claims. Robert Hutchins was able to do this even with a fairly antiquated educational philosophy because he had conviction, and because he had conviction he was able to be persuasive as far as the Regents were concerned.

It sometimes seems that the president of a small college has the easier job. I'm not sure this is true, because there the fights are very likely to be of a family sort, face to face and within a narrow confine; but there is something, I think, to the point that colleges have a chance to stand for something, and thereby to generate a kind of solidarity among the constituents and the people who run them. It is a sad thing for me that instead of valuing individuality, too many of our better liberal arts colleges try to be like the big universities, by recruiting nationally, by trying to please everyone, and by surrendering the uniqueness which made them great in the first place. Such colleges can be honest, reveal openly what their problems are, get rid of the usual public relations business, and play it quite straight with the students and with the public. This, as a matter of fact, would be quite sensational. It is interesting to recall that Abraham Maslow, as president of the American Psychological Association, has made the point that if you really want to make some money, you should enter a business noted for its cut-throat quality and be honest. He suggests that an honest garage mechanic would really be extremely successful today.

Administration can be learned, of course, and all kinds of technical assistance can be made available. The main thing, it seems to me, is to put first things first, which means establishing and maintaining a basis for trust. Business organizations are learning that social satisfaction and the personal growth of employees must be criteria of success, along with profits and expansion. There is irony in the fact that universities, whose main concern is or should be with personal growth, are too often willing to sacrifice human values in the interests of knowledge production. And what is this knowledge? It is mostly knowledge about how to kill people and how to keep people alive. It is not so much knowledge about how to live. If it were, we would not be in so much difficulty on the national scene and there would not be so many problems connected with running our universities.

It would be a great help, I think, if presidents would deliberately set out to restore or to build confidence, and to counteract the impersonal value system that prevails in so many of these institutions. Not only must or should a president let his own humanity shine through, but he must deliberately work for the humanization of all within his institution. In the case of that dean I mentioned, the president should make it quite clear that this tendency to identify oneself with a role is present in universities, and being forewarned about this sort of thing, speak to a dean who looks as if he is allowing this to happen to him. This may be necessary in order to protect the humanity of that dean and, through him, the humanity of the students. These kinds of processes of dehumanization and humanization can be spelled out and made familiar to people who run our universities.

Concerning the qualities of the president, I am taking the position that a president's behavior depends very, very heavily on the situation in which he finds himself, and I am arguing that the administrative skills can be learned. Among the qualities which must be there in the first place are courage and intelligence and education.

It is interesting to ask some of the young people, as I have done, "How was it that President Kennedy stood as such a glowing figure for young people?" It seems that very, very important was the demonstration in him that intelligence and education really could count for something in the world of affairs; this, and the fact that he was capable of self-objectification, a kind of humor in which he saw himself out there carrying on a campaign or carrying on in the highest public office. Also important, quite stunning for young people, was his ability to admit he had made a mistake, something that is very, very rare in political offices, of course. But these are simple marks of maturity; they are not rare, and they can be found in numerous professors on our campuses right now.

Faculties also have opportunities to lead, and should be encouraged to do so. They have more freedom than the president. Nobody is preventing them from saying what they think; and if they want to initiate a program of education within their universities, they are likely to find the president in strong support of them. But in order to have this occur, there must be a change of attitude of a very broad sort. The faculty must take some interest in general education and begin to conceive of themselves as educators; and unless a higher proportion of faculty become interested in students, eager to know some of them and willing to do something for them, not much is going to happen. Such interest and concern is foreign to most teachers on our campuses today. Most are not interested in discussing education and are not well informed about it.

It is still true, or at least it was until after the student protest at Berkeley, that most university teachers would regard it as dangerous to their careers to show a genuine interest in students. This would be regarded in the disciplines as putting students ahead of subjects, or as part of an attempt to turn the campus into a therapeutic community. I say a change of attitude is necessary because we cannot put our faith in piecemeal or superficial innovation. What is called for is a basic change in the reward system of college and university teachers. Nobody knows how this is to be brought about, but surely we must begin by recognizing how serious and deep-seated the problem is.

To ask the college teacher to be aware of the changing needs of students and be on hand to meet the needs of particular ones is, of course, to ask a great deal. This is individual education of the sort that is ordinarily found only at a few expensive colleges. Yet we need not be discouraged in the possibility of realizing some of the benefits of that system in large institutions. For one thing, increasing knowledge of personality development in students and of the meaning of student-faculty relationships may become increasingly a part of faculty culture, so that it may influence the day-to-day behavior of the faculty member. Much will depend on our ability to produce literature on our students that is sufficiently interesting and well written so that the faculty member can ignore it only with difficulty.

At the same time, it is well to remember that what matters is not the frequency or duration of faculty-student encounters, but their quality. I have heard both students and faculty recount instances in which a few minutes of communication in the right circumstances sufficed to change a student's life. A show of personal interest at a time when a student is in special need of it, or a show of firmness when this is clearly in the student's interest, takes little time and could become a natural occurrence in a faculty-student community. It may be of crucial import to the student's development.

It is well to realize, too, that most undergraduates are not looking for intimate relationships with the faculty. Many, including some of the best ones, have guilt feelings and are afraid of being found out. We are not likely to be overwhelmed by students. There is no call for us to have relationships of equality and good fellowship with students, and there is little to be gained from our seeing students in order to meet our needs for popularity. What is called for is an arrangement of the academic body that will make it possible for students and faculty to get at each other, to reveal themselves to each other, so that truly beneficial brief encounters can occur. Also called for is the sort of outlook I spoke of earlier, one which is neither sentimental nor clinical but embodies a decent concern for the student as a human being, for whose development the faculty has some responsibility.

My title actually had the word "research" in it, and I'll say just one word about that: here, too, the personal qualities of the leader should have a chance to express themselves. Vast research institutes can be administered, to be sure, but in the long run, most productive are those small centers in which the leader is an intellectual leader who has the ideas, who respects the ideas of others, and who works a little harder than most of us. I think of those examples in psychology, such as Kurt Lewin, who was the center of a group of researchers, or Harry Murray at Harvard. These little one-man shows, I think, are the most productive of research in many areas in college. There is some tolerance for these one-man shows in universities, provided they don't become too large, of course.

To summarize, the crisis in higher education is bound up with the major crisis in our society. Our expanding technology, with its accent on administration, specialization, consultation, and consensus, has led to an erosion of leadership; and our situation in the world, an island of affluence in a sea of poverty, engaged in a struggle with nations over the direction of the world revolution, has led to a confusion of means and ends and to a credibility gap of near catastrophic proportions. The failings of the larger society are mirrored in our universities. There is a lack of moral commitment; human values are sacrificed to the power of success and reputation; men identify themselves with their roles or publicly advocate what they inwardly deplore; and so students ask whither it is they are being led, whom they can admire, and they find it difficult to get an answer.

There are no scientific or technological solutions to these problems. We have to decide what kind of people we want to be, and then summon the necessary courage. The officers and teachers of our colleges and universities must lead and not be merely administrators or transmitters of information. They must start with an educational philosophy that puts the student at the center of the institution's activities, and they must realize that students cannot become fully human unless their leaders are so already.

The first task of a president is to explain his philosophy to the public, using the same words he uses in addressing students, and thus to de-escalate the warfare between these two groups. The more he knows of students, the easier and more enjoyable he will find this task. With firmness in his educational faith, the president of even the most complex university can be more than a mediator among conflicting interests and claims, for he will have a basis for judging priorities. In a largely impersonal world that threatens to become more so, he should strive to make every encounter with individuals or groups a human one. This is not a matter of being a good fellow. It is a matter of revealing himself as a person, a person who knows the difference between himself and his role. Although quiet persuasion has great merit, the president must show students where he stands on some important issues—that is to say, moral issues—and if there is danger in the position he takes, so much the better. Even the faculty will require that he come through occasionally. If he does this, then some of the faculty will like him very much, and the hostility of the others will be a welcome sign that he has done the right thing.

Most of what has been said about the president holds for the faculty as well, though we must understand that they are a more case-hardened group, less likely than the president to have a humanistic philosophy of education; but many of them can be interested in education, and they have more freedom than the president. Nothing is preventing them from saying what they think, and if they wish to take advantage of the anarchy they have created to initiate new programs on their campuses, they will probably find the president supporting them. Whether they think of themselves as educators or not, they cannot avoid being models for their students. It was to the professors, after all, that the Stanford student addressed his plea. They, as well as the president, must be men.

Redefining the ethics of academia

PART
I
CHAPTER
3

HENRY T. YOST, JR.

MERELY ACCEPTING THE SUBJECT for debate implies that there is an ethic of the academic distinct from the ethic of the more general society and that this peculiar ethic is in need of reform. While I am perfectly willing to accept the existence of a special ethic that has been developed by academicians over the last ten centuries, I am not convinced that this ethic has become inapplicable to the modern scholar. Therefore, I should like to suggest that any debate on professional ethics must have as its primary task an attempt to determine whether the transformation of modern mass society makes inevitable the transformation of the entire academic enterprise.

Those lovely days when the university could exist in comparative isolation from the rest of society are gone. In a time when there was a need for a large reservoir of unskilled workers, education did not have to be closely related to the fundamental drives of society. However, in a modern industrial society, the need for highly trained technicians has united the educational institutions with the outside world. Now, that world is no longer willing to let us go our own way. Since our very complex society is ever more dependent upon technological achievements, regulation of the economy, mass education in general, it is ever more dependent upon the minds of the intellectuals within the university. The professor has been given the dual role of supplying skilled workers (his students) and of doing the research necessary to develop new techniques for the solution of socially important problems. An important question, then, is whether the modern, affluent society will find itself less and less able to afford the luxury of the contemplative scholar.

I have no quarrel with the idea that we should be involved with the outside world. We have our responsibilities to the society that clothes and feeds us, and we owe it more than either lip service or the production of automatons to fill an intellectual factory. Bertolt Brecht has caught the essence of the modern scholar when he gives Galileo this speech:

> They drenched us in their bribes and threats but could we deny ourselves to the crowd and still remain scientists? The movements of the stars have become clearer, but to the mass of people, the movements of their masters are still incalculable. The fight over the measurements of the heavens has been won through doubt, but the fight of the Roman housewife for milk is ever and again lost through faith. . . . What are you looking for? I maintain that the only purpose of science is to ease the hardship of human existence.

But there are other voices in the hall. Many who are calling for the professor to leave the ivory tower and relate to society do not have the aspirations of Brecht. Their cry is far more prosaic: "Why don't you move with the times? Give up old-fashioned, conservative idealism and go on to the great new frontier in the sky. We are the new alchemists, turning wood pulp into gold. We want to accept you and use you as our equal. All that you have to understand is that our values are in tune with the future. We are the new wave, and you can be part of us." The Establishment has always wanted consensus. More than anything else, it wants the intellectual to accept its standards; and the methods used to obtain acceptance have been extremely effective. These men are, indeed, alchemists, but they are using gold as the touchstone to turn professors into entrepreneurs.

My major ethical concern is that the extent of this transformation has escaped notice. Too few of my friends have mentioned it to me with any misgiving. Yet the time has come when a professor will conspire with a book company to cheat his students by publishing a second-rate text purely for profit, and when a biochemist will withhold the tools of research to increase his own chance for fame. It is a time when a list of the ethical problems of scientists contain the following: (1) The selling of research and development of proposals whose fate may strongly affect the scientist's career . . . must be reconciled with the traditional responsibility of the scientist to evaluate the defects as well as the virtues of the hypothesis; (2) Increasing managerial and administrative power in the hands of scientists unfamiliar with the uses of such power creates opportunities and temptations for arbitrary wielding of authority which must be reconciled with traditional emphasis on appeal to reason and on courtesy among colleagues.

I will not go on to quote the eight other problems raised by Lawrence Cranberg in his excellent article (*Physics Today,* 1965). Each is an attempt to reconcile the values of science with the values of business. I do not believe that these values can be reconciled, and any attempt to use the business ethic as a new professional ethic can only be made by accepting the common argument that since everyone else does it, why shouldn't we? As intellectuals, we must be able to relate to society without accepting all parts of it. It is our duty to reject the doctrine that mass guilt is really mass exoneration. On the other hand, while it is important in cases of individual misconduct to locate the corruptor, we cannot stop without asking who is accepting the corruption. If the professor is to be his own policeman, he is responsible. If he loses his standards, only he is to blame.

Unfortunately, the situation has become even more serious than the corruption of individual professors by the desire for money or for status outside the profession. It has recently become evident that an entire university may become involved in projects that are incompatible with the functioning of an academic institution. One only need consider Project Camelot, or the use of a Michigan State research project by the CIA, to understand that there has been an attempt to integrate the university with governmental functions to the extent that research may become indistinguishable from intelligence work. The fact that the University of Pennsylvania has proclaimed that only publishable research can be done under University auspices is reassuring; but, nevertheless, the problem for the individual professor that is posed by the direct participation of the government in a variety of academic projects remains unanswered. What happens when the ethic of a professor apparently comes into conflict with what is assumed to be his patriotic duty?

The debate about the proper function of the university is synonymous with the debate about professional ethics. The primary obligation of the scholar is to the pursuit of truth and the advancement of knowledge. Nothing other than openness will suffice. Thus, we must recognize that a call for a redefinition of the ethics of the profession may well stem from an attempt to change the definition of the academic process and, ultimately, to change our primary values. It is easy enough to say that, after all, the professor is like everybody else. He has a job to do, and he must do it, and there is no standard of behavior that is higher than a love of country.

For a professor, used to dealing with complex problems, the eloquence of a superpatriot may not be convincing. As intellectuals, we understand that a sincere love of country may be expressed in a scathing attack upon some particular act of that country. But the rest of society does not understand. If we want them to, we must be prepared to define what it is that a university does that makes it distinct from a trade school, a business, or even a government research institute. A debate about professional ethics is rooted in this distinction, since whatever the ethics of the profession are to be, they must be consistent with academic life.

Unfortunately, it is not only the outside society that does not understand the special nature of our ethic. In the past, we have relied on consensus to determine the modes of conduct that are consistent with the character of intellectual life. Now, however, we are being asked more than whether our ethic is appropriate for the modern scholar; we are being asked whether governance by consensus is satisfactory to prevent a serious breakdown of professional conduct. Partially, this is the result of the relatively few, but widely reported, cases of individual or collective misconduct; but more importantly, it is the result of the extremely rapid growth of our profession in the last twenty years. The change in attitude of society has made the profession more attractive, and this very attractiveness must result in an influx of people, some of whom do not accept the standards of the profession from the very beginning of their careers.

Furthermore, the great demand for teachers in higher education has resulted in a certain lowering of professional standards. This is the traditional problem of mass education in the United States, and I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not opposed to mass education. However, it is not easy to deal with a teacher shortage. Since students are present and necessary to society, all too frequently people are used as professors who are not qualified to be so used. Many of these have come from secondary education, from business, or from other professions; and while most of the transfers have done a good job of adapting to a new and difficult situation, we cannot escape the fact that the values of some are not the same as those of the traditional professor. The acceptance of traditional ethical standards may be even more difficult for these people than it is for the young people who enter the profession without serious thought about such standards.

It was to meet the mounting concern about ethical standards largely arising from the complex of problems presented above that the National Education Association and the American Association of University Professors published statements on professional ethics. I have no quarrel with the contents of either. As is necessary, both are extremely general. Even though it is the mark of Cain to accept a document prepared by a committee as even a first approximation of one's own beliefs, I am willing to accept them as a summary of the consensus of our profession. On the other hand, the NEA *Code of Ethics* goes one step further than the AAUP statement, and I regret that step as a matter of principle. Both the definition of a code of ethics as put forward by the NEA (a social control device designed to regulate the professional practice and conduct of its members in their relationships with clients, colleagues, and the public) and the existence of standards for enforcement of the code must suggest to the public that more is intended than a statement of generally accepted standards. While I can agree that the size of the profession makes enforcement by consensus difficult, I feel strongly that no other form of enforcement is compatible with the traditions of the university.

Let me make my position more clear by focusing on a single issue. One of the most important roles of the intellectual in any society is that of a critic. We are supported by society because we render a service, but that service is not merely to supply fodder for students. By our critical appraisal of what was and what is, we make it possible for society to advance to what might be. In such a role one can be responsible only to the truth; and since we know how ephemeral the truth can be, in the final analysis we must be responsible only to ourselves. I must emphasize that to accept such a statement implies an essential premise that an intellectual is not merely a self-seeking social parasite. We can operate on that premise only so long as the development of our critical facilities makes it possible for us to reject our own opinions, as well as the opinions of others, and only so long as we recognize that the purpose of intellectual life is to provide a context for debate. The ethics of our profession were constructed and survive by debate. My hope is that the present debate will be a vehicle for the projection of the values of the scholar to the mass of society, rather than a corridor for the reverse process.

One of the appeals of a code of ethics is clarity. A law can be written so as to remove gray areas from our lives. However, in writing such a law, we may remove those areas about which debate is important and sacrifice debate to achieve stability. I submit that a stable society is not the desire of the intellectual, *as an intellectual.* In one sense, our search is always for instability, for finding out what is wrong with a thing. To a scientist, as to any scholar, the greatest value of an hypothesis is that it can be disproved. The formulation of a set of rules is far too simple for the ethical problems faced by an academician. For the great part of his life, he lives where most people do not, where simple rules will not help, and where enforcement procedures can only result in an abridgment of the freedom that is the primary characteristic of his intellectual life.

It is widely agreed that the freedom of the professor carries with it a special responsibility, but there is a need to debate the nature of that responsibility. To the outside world, responsibility means conformity. On the contrary, I would maintain that the major obligation of the intellectual is to make his opinions known. Academic freedom has meaning only in this context, in that it is a means to reduce the penalty for honesty. The only way that a critic can function is to express his ideas clearly, loudly, and frequently. If those ideas are without merit, it will soon become apparent, even to the critic. The truly irresponsible member of our profession is the man who withholds his ideas, either to curry favor or to protect his shallowness from public exposure. No one would suggest that it is unnatural for society to restrict the freedom of the scholar; after all, he is only human and a citizen. However, the pressures to conform are contradictory to the life that the intellectual must lead, if he is truly to render the service to society that it requires of him. As a public document, a code of ethics reinforces the impression that restrictions of academic freedom are possible with no loss to the primary purpose of academia. This cannot be the case. If our primary obligation is to the advancement of knowledge, we must educate our students to be responsible for their own activities, to understand the meaning of doubt and the use of doubt in the fight over both the measurement of the heavens and the need of the Roman housewife for milk. If we, as professors, cannot live without a code and with the constant danger of losing our balance while walking the narrow ridge between doubt and faith, then we have nothing of importance to teach our students.

I have been told that the AAUP *Statement on Professional Ethics* is too general and too high-minded. Is it really hopelessly old-fashioned to believe that someone might read such stuff aloud? I think we are in danger of losing all that we are supposed to represent if we titter in the presence of this statement. We *are* the guardians of truth. By a venerable tradition, we are the guardians of the aspirations of man. We, at least, must recognize that the soul is not for sale. Our goal is not to be immortalized in print, nor is it self-esteem or self-aggrandizement. Our purpose is to preserve that part of life for which there is no price.

PART II

ENLARGED RESPONSIBILITY

California higher education: a report from the underground

PART
II
CHAPTER
1

JESSE M. UNRUH

IN REPORTING ON SOME of the recent events involving higher education in California I will not really be straying far from the theme of this book. The recent California experience directly involves the question of leadership and change in higher education. We are witnessing in California today, I suspect, much of the latter and little of the former.

I will start, rather arbitrarily, with last December's student strike at the Berkeley campus, and with one man's problem during that strike. I do not refer to Clark Kerr or Roger Heyns, but to the sound technician controlling the controversial public address system on the steps of Sproul Hall.

No administrator faced a more vexing dilemma. Let me quote this gentleman's own description of the problem he faced: "The University wants me to keep the sound down when the audience is small," he said, "and the police want me to make it loud enough for their recording apparatus—it's a problem."

It was a problem, to be sure—part of the over-all problem of the failure of communications which may turn out to be the central problem of modern university governance. The failure of internal communications helps to explain the strike, and the breakdown of communications with the outside community helps to explain the presence of police recording equipment on the campus.

In my opinion, the strike itself was an exercise in futility for everyone involved. The strikers did not really have much of a case. They contended that they were protesting an administrative decision which they considered to be an act of hypocrisy and a denial of student participation in their own affairs. But they reached this conclusion and began their protest without making any effort to negotiate or even articulate their grievances.

I do not believe that an academic strike can ever be justified; but from any perspective, this strike was all but meaningless from the beginning. It was eventually interpreted as another expression of dissatisfaction with the lack of communications among students, faculty, and administration, and with the presumed lack of constancy in the administration's reaction to student participation in campus affairs. These issues had already been defined and were already on the way to successful resolution.

The campus reaction to this disruptive incident was fairly calm and unspectacular. The academic community continued its reassessment of the gains and losses in campus administrative practices since the Free Speech Movement of 1964. The Student-Faculty Commission, established to study the rules and regulations relating to student conduct and participation in campus affairs, recognized the need both to broaden channels of communication and to restructure the concept of *in loco parentis* for a more sophisticated clientele.

The strike, then, containing as it did great potential for disaster, actually highlighted the University's ability to solve its own problems alone, without significant outside interference. Unfortunately, what should have been a happy ending turned out to be only the first act of the drama.

The next significant event was, of course, the dismissal of President Clark Kerr. I will not attempt here to describe the anatomy of the dismissal or to recount its definitive causes. I am not sure I understand them even now. For some, the dismissal was simply a logical reaction to the series of Berkeley "crises." For others, it was a repudiation of the policy of assimilation which had been used by the University administration with regard to protests and infractions of campus regulations. Many others, including the worldwide press, saw the firing as a gesture of appeasement to a new political administration. This conclusion, though perhaps unwarranted, was at least logical. The new Governor had expressed dissatisfaction with Mr. Kerr, and his denunciation of the "mess at Berkeley" had been a recurring campaign theme.

But no matter why it was done, the dismissal of Mr. Kerr was most untimely. There were many dire consequences of this act. The suspicion that the University is regarded as no more than another weapon in the political arsenal has undermined the prestige of all of California's public higher education system. Other universities throughout the nation—indeed, throughout the world—have interpreted the dismissal as an intellectually insensitive threat to academic freedom. Their suspicions are again perhaps wrong, but understandable.

Within California, the position of the University has definitely been weakened. The confidence of faculty, students, and administration has been severely shaken. In the midst of grave crisis, this vast educational complex is left without experienced leadership in a position to argue the case of the University. I need hardly add that this job is going to be awfully hard to fill. The everyday management duties alone would intimidate the most gifted administrator. A recent visitor from France described an ideal candidate of his acquaintance with these words:

> A brilliantly educated, scientifically trained administrator who, when he directed a large educational and scientific institution, proved himself capable of maintaining peace and efficiency among a multi-racial group of students, faculty, and employees that included Communists, right-wing militarists, colonial-minded conservative politicians, and revolutionaries. In other words—Ho Chi Minh, who accomplished all that as the chief of the Pasteur Institute in French Indochina.

Don't be alarmed at this suggestion. I understand Ho has already declined the position. He has the typical Communist's obsession with job security.

Whether by design or by accident, the dismissal of Mr. Kerr did focus responsibility for the current crisis of public higher education in California upon the new administration, and that is precisely where it belongs. This is a problem brought to the state by that administration and not the other way around.

In his current economy crusade the Governor has proposed an average cut in all budgets of 10 percent, but he insists upon a 30 percent cut in the University's budget. Even on his own terms, he has discriminated against the University. Traditionally, the University is actually budgeted at a figure within 5 percent of its request. This year the Regents have shown an unprecedented spirit of compromise, and have proposed budget cuts of 15 to 20 percent at the expense of some 5000 new admissions next year. The Governor so far, however, adamantly refuses to enter into this spirit of compromise and continues to insist that the budget be cut by the 30 percent he proposes.

As this paper goes to press, the last word on the University's budget has not been spoken. The Legislature has not yet acted, and it is extremely unlikely that the Governor's disastrous proposal will be adopted in its entirety. But California's Constitution permits the Governor to reduce any expenditure authorized by the Legislature, so it is probable that the new administration will be able to exact some measure of tribute from higher education this year.

For the first time California faces the likelihood of turning qualified students away from the University. As I indicated earlier, this is a decision made by the Regents—a decision from which I vigorously dissent. But the Governor has also demanded that the Regents violate California tradition in at least one other respect. He insists that we end our ninety-nine-year-old tradition of tuition-free public higher education. The Governor's suggestion would make the University of California just about the most expensive major state university in the nation. Combined tuition and fees would be a few dollars more than those charged by the State University of New York.

Of course New York's public higher education system offers a liberal program of scholarships, and one might be inclined to support tuition if it would have this effect of equalizing education opportunity in California. Indeed, Governor Reagan says that a large percentage of tuition funds would be used for scholarships. But if *all* the money raised by charging tuition at our University and state colleges were used for scholarships, we would only be able to establish a program about half the size of New York's. And we have little reason to hope that the new administration envisions a student aid program of anywhere near this magnitude. The only concrete proposal the Governor has made so far with respect to scholarships is to cut our present meager program by 10 percent.

I have no objection to a tuition proposal *per se*. A recent report by our

Assembly Subcommittee on Higher Education raises many thoughtful questions about tuition. The Subcommittee found that low-income and minority students were under-represented in our institutions of higher learning—that our tuition-free policy was not effective in equalizing educational opportunity. It also concluded that if tuition were charged, the institutions would be even less effective in this regard unless there were massive increases in student scholarship and subsistence funds.

But the Subcommittee went beyond this basic view of tuition to ask some broader questions. What would be the effect of charging tuition upon the mix of occupational skills produced by higher education? What would be the effect upon the supply and demand of the essential professions?

Our Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education has undertaken a macro-economic study of higher education in California and will provide us with the answers upon which we can base a decision on whether tuition should or should not be imposed. But I am sure that the new Governor does not have the answers to these questions. I doubt that he even asked most of the questions before precipitously demanding this new tax on education.

There are other, thoroughly studied revenue sources available in California. The withholding of income taxes, for example, would produce more net new revenue each year than the Governor's proposed tuition would produce for years to come.

Throughout this Kafka-esque tuition controversy, one theme is emphasized by the new administration with ominous regularity. The Governor says that tuition will really help students; that it will "mature" them; that "someone is going to have to give some consideration to how badly he wants to go to school"; that "it might affect those who are there really not to study, but to agitate, it might make them think twice about paying a fee for the privilege of carrying a picket sign."

The Lieutenant Governor tempers the language, if not the idea. "In this discussion," he has said, "these points should not be overlooked: we have never advocated tuition as a revenue raiser; we have thought of it as a discipline, as an investment in enriching the lives of students through fuller participation in the academic life of the campus."

The implication is clear. This administration is attempting to justify charging tuition as a punishment for student activists. Even if it were just to use taxation for this purpose, the use of tuition is both unfair and illogical. It is unfair because it is, in effect, a fine on *all* students levied for the real and imagined infractions of a small minority. This is reminiscent of the harried mother who punished all her children for the actions of one culprit whom she hasn't time to identify. This may sometimes be necessary in a family situation, but it is a ridiculous position for government ever to take.

The logic of charging tuition as a device for weeding out undesirables is contradicted by the facts. The students who demonstrated recently at Stanford in opposition to Vice President Humphrey's appearance there pay a tuition of some $1800 a year. In 1964, the year of the Sproul Hall sit-in, Mario Savio paid a tuition, as a nonresident, of $800. It is difficult to see just whom tuition is going to "discipline," but experience has shown us who is *not* likely to be affected—the determined student agitator.

Taking the theoretical approach, it would seem most probable that the student who has a greater financial stake in his education would be more inclined to express with vehemence his view of the educational and social establishment. After all, he has paid a pretty high admission price.

I am implacably opposed to this administration's attempt to impose tuition through the device of a budget cut, and I resent its effort to sell this proposal through an appeal to an incipient distrust of higher learning. If the dragon's teeth of anti-intellectualism can be successfully sown in California, then we will reap the armies of ignorance for years to come. And the implications of this attitude go well beyond the borders of my state.

California's system of higher education is the archetype for higher education systems throughout the nation—not only in structure, but also in the level of state government commitment. The recognition that higher education is an investment producing rich dividends, as it has for California, is an obvious motivating factor in the vastly increased higher education budgets of New York's Governor Rockefeller, Michigan's Governor Romney, Texas' Governor Connally, Minnesota's Governor LeVander, Wisconsin's Governor Knowles, Oregon's Governor McCall, and Washington's Governor Evans, among many others. Clearly, an understanding of the value of a sound and expanding higher education system cuts across party lines and the ideological spectrum, but the Governor of California remains the outstanding, ultimately ironic holdout.

Perhaps it is a presumption for a Californian to ask this, but I do so only rhetorically. What happens to education in other states when the future of the model system is in doubt? California, for good or ill, has given the world a glimpse into the future. We have shown the direction contemporary urban development is likely to take. We are now experiencing the long-range effects of the constant acceleration of technology and science. If California's higher education system falters now, what does it presage for similar systems throughout the country?

What I have described here, perhaps too pessimistically, is in part the result of a chronic disengagement between politics and the intellectual community that has long—too long—characterized American life. I am willing to concede that politicians were probably responsible for this originally. There was a time when most politicians equated intellect with agitation. They rejected the world of ideas almost altogether because ideas tended to rock the boat.

But nearly the reverse of this is true today. Politicians welcome the contributions of the intellectual community, but many intellectuals reject politics out of hand. For them, politics necessarily involves compromise and expediency that are irrelevant to, and perhaps violative of, honest intellectual inquiry.

The academic community, in its legitimate desire to keep politics out of education, somehow feels it must reciprocate by keeping its members out of participation in politics. It is difficult to assess how destructive this attitude is, but it should be obvious that this no man's land of misunderstanding must be crossed. I do not suggest that college professors immediately start ringing doorbells and licking stamps in support of their local Democratic candidates, although I can think of instances in which such efforts may be appropriate. I am suggesting a broad, continuing, mutual discussion between scholars and politicians.

A few years ago the California Legislature and the University of California launched a series of seminars in which legislators spent a few days on the campus in discussion with experts in one or another of the academic disciplines. We were impressed, of course, with the high level of scholarship we found, and this is to be expected. But many of the academicians expressed surprise at the knowledge of the legislators and their willingness to accept innovative ideas. Some substantive, imaginative legislation resulted from those seminars, as did a new mutual respect. I am sure that this had its effect on legislative politics with regard to higher education in my state, and I am sure it would be fruitful elsewhere. Modern government is so comprehensive that it can benefit from scholarship in virtually every academic discipline.

Perhaps the seminar mechanism is not appropriate for every institution or each branch of government. I advocate no rigid formula. I ask rather that educators' efforts be applied to working out the best political liaison possible in their circumstances. It may be too much to say that more political-academic understanding could have prevented the current disruption in California, but it certainly would not have made it worse. The task of political leadership is to upgrade government to utilize science and technology.

In spite of my dour description of our problems in my state, there is cause for optimism. The battle for continued progress in California higher education has just begun, and it now moves into a new arena—the State Legislature. This is a battleground I know something about. And the opening shot in this battle has been fired. For the first time in California history, our chief fiscal advisor, the Legislative Analyst, recommended increasing a gubernatorial budget—including the budget for higher education. And this nonpartisan accounting officer is hired to recommend budget cuts.

Theodore Roosevelt used to end his campaign speeches with the statement, "We stand at Armageddon and we battle for the Lord." I suppose that has an absurd ring in our far less innocent age, but the skirmish in which we are involved in California is, assuredly, serious. If I have somehow succeeded in enlisting the support of a few, I want to state that educators can make the job of legislative leadership in higher education a great deal more promising.

PART
II
CHAPTER
2

Leadership and change in higher education

DOUGLASS CATER

LAST YEAR THE VICE PRESIDENT REMARKED about the infiltration of the highest stratum of government by ex-professors—Dean Rusk, Robert McNamara, Willard Wirtz, John Gardner, Robert Weaver, and Mr. Humphrey himself. These men constitute a majority of the Cabinet, and their zeal for education is surpassed only by that of the former instructor from Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

This infiltration of government in Washington is not limited to the top echelon. By recent count, forty-two members of the Administration at sub-Cabinet level have been drawn from the ranks of university presidents, deans, and professors. In my own assignment to work on education programs, I share the company not only of HEW Secretary John Gardner and Commissioner of Education Harold Howe, but of an academic team that includes Under Secretary Wilbur Cohen of the University of Michigan; Assistant Secretary Paul Miller, former president of the University of West Virginia; Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology Don Hornig of Princeton; Assistant Secretary of State Charles Frankel of Columbia; Chairman of the National Endowment For the Humanities Barnaby Keeney of Brown University; Secretary of the Smithsonian S. Dillon Ripley of Yale; and Director of the National Science Foundation Leland Haworth of MIT.

Having been a long-time journalist in Washington, I marvel at the transformation. As recently as 1962, I remember writing a magazine article in the *Reporter* describing the latest failure by Congress to pass a bill for higher education and concluding pessimistically, "Some skeptics on Capitol Hill dismiss federal aid to education as a program that doesn't really interest the public and therefore doesn't excite Congress."

I was a poor prophet. We have witnessed a revolution in the federal commitment to education, high and low, during the past three years. Nineteen major education measures have been submitted to Congress by President Johnson and enacted into law. Last January the President sent to Congress a budget proposing an outlay for higher education in the year ahead of $4.5 million—over three times the amount spent in 1960. More than $1 billion will go for facilities, equipment, and institutional development; nearly $2 billion for support of undergraduate, graduate, and professional training; $1.5 billion for university-based research. The federal share of total national expenditures for higher education is now passing the 25 percent mark.

You know better than I the effect this has had. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, quotes one analyst who claims that "Roughly every second student living on campus now sleeps in a government-owned bed." The impact on university resources not devoted to slumber has been scarcely less dramatic.

The federal government remains firmly committed to its role as junior in this country's education partnership. Yet it would be idle to ignore the fact that federal programs do set priorities in every area of higher education and raise fundamental problems for those who serve our colleges and universities. Federal programs impose urgent calls on each of the three major functions of the university—teaching, research, and public service.

Recently, during a visit to the United States Office of Education on its one hundredth birthday, President Johnson summed up the challenge to teaching: "We are no longer satisfied simply with free public education. We have declared as our national goal that all children shall have the chance to get as much education as they can absorb—no matter how poor they are, no matter what color they are, and no matter where they live."

Fulfillment of this goal is placing heavy strains on the facilities and manpower of our colleges and universities. Our best estimates are that college population will double during the present decade. By 1975 total college enrollment is expected to reach 9 million students. More than 300,000 additional professional staff members will be needed.

Federal policy is not content that higher education should be available only to those growing numbers of students who can afford it. Next year's budget provides for more than 2 million beneficiaries of grants, loans, and work-study programs—many of whom might not otherwise have been able to go to college. Through Opportunity Grants and the Upward Bound program, the university is being urged to seek out the promising student from a disadvantaged background and help him overcome the handicaps which formerly could have closed the door to higher education.

Nor does federal policy condone the neglect of the disadvantaged institution. Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 seeks to encourage those colleges. A title which provides for developing institutions seeks to encourage and to support those fraternal ties in higher education which will stimulate excellence in every institution which has the will to work for it.

The university is being pushed by federal policy to serve a role as innovator in education at the lower levels. The Regional Education Laboratories established within the universities are meant to bring new ideas, new techniques, and new teaching materials to the nation's school systems. Colleges and universities have important responsibilities for the direction of Head Start and the Teacher Corps.

Finally, federal programs place urgent new priorities on the university for training of manpower to fill the tremendous shortage in the health field, to develop new skills for social service, to prepare planners and administrators and leaders for government at all levels.

A second category of federal need calls on the university's research resources. Federal support for university-based research next year will amount to $1.5 billion, approximately two-thirds of the total spent by the universities. Undoubtedly, this massive funding growing out of wartime necessity has contributed to the university's enrichment. Since the end of World War II, by one simple measure, there have been fifty-six American winners of the Nobel Prize—more than 40 percent of the world total—most of them from the universities.

There is little doubt, also, that the demand for research has placed strains on the university and the higher education community. How to preserve a proper balance between teaching and research, between the sciences and the humanities? How to avoid a growing concentration of talent in a very few institutions? A year and a half ago President Johnson called attention to the fact that one-half of federal expenditures for research go to twenty major institutions. He declared, as government policy, "We want to find excellence and build it up wherever it is found so that creative centers of excellence may grow up in every part of the nation." Today, the principal supporters of research—the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—have all inaugurated programs for developing scientific excellence in institutions which fall below the top rank.

Still a third category of federal need calls on the university to perform a public service mission. More strongly perhaps than in any other country, we share the sentiment expressed by Woodrow Wilson when he declared, "It is not learning, but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the public annals of the nation. . . . The air of affairs should be admitted to all its classrooms—and the school must be of the nation." This sentiment has been felt in Washington at least since the latter half of the nineteenth century, when Congress passed measures encouraging the university to face the problems of agrarian America. This application of brainpower helped produce the abundance that has made our nation the world's grocer.

This was what encouraged President Johnson to call on the universities to face the present-day problems of urban America. Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the title for University Extension Services, represents a federal commitment to support this new challenge to higher education. The problem of our cities, we recognize, is too urgent for further delay.

Two years ago, the President voiced a similar challenge relating to the world beyond our nation's shorelines. His Message to Congress declared that international education represents a long-term commitment in the national interest, and the International Education Act, passed in the final days of the 89th Congress, seeks to develop our university resources for meeting that commitment.

This is by no means the complete inventory of federal interest in higher education. It does not, for example, take account of separate claims by state and local government. But it is sufficient to indicate the competing challenges which confront higher education. It gives added relevance to the soul-searching question asked by President James Perkins of Cornell, "Can the university keep pace within the modern world, let alone bear the torch that lights the way?" That question evokes as much interest in Washington as it does on the campus. The federal government, despite the urgency of its claims, has developed growing awareness of the university's own needs. We have come a long way from the World War II mentality when government treated the university pretty much as a contractor paying only for services rendered. There has been considerable advance over the immediate post-Sputnik spirit, when aid to higher education had to be slipped through the back door under the guise of supporting our nation's defense. Congress no longer faces a deadlock in voting grants and loans to private as well as public institutions.

The measures sponsored by President Johnson have moved government even further from the old contractor relationship. The National Defense Education Act has been amended and transformed into support for a wide range of graduate studies. The Higher Education Act, the Higher Educational Facilities Act, the Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, the International Education Act, and the newly proposed Public Television Act—each has the common purpose of enriching the university's capacity for defining and developing its own sense of role. Advisory councils of educators are helping chart the progress and set the guidelines for each one of these programs. As we look to the future, task forces draw heavily on the higher education community which are exploring new ideas and making new proposals.

The President's Message to Congress on Education and Health took a number of steps toward recognizing the need for the federal effort in higher education to be better coordinated and better planned for the university's own benefit. One particular bill mentioned in his message was the Educational Professions Act, which is designed to pull together all the fragmented support programs for training in the educational professions and to extend them so there are no longer categories such as university administrators who are automatically excluded from all help.

In addition, the federal government has been showing a new awareness, it seems to me, and developing the kinds of innovation in institutional building that deals properly with the university. The Arts and Humanities Foundation is very well conceived as a form of federal assistance that does not smack of political overtones. The newly proposed Public Television Corporation is another innovation which would create a body, insulated from federal government interference, which could move in the extremely delicate area of educational television support.

Some would advocate further steps to promote cohesiveness in the federal support of higher education. Some advocate the consolidation of programs or the substitution of bloc institutional support. Some seek the bureaucratic amalgamation of the various agencies dealing with education. Some call for the creation of a Council of Education Advisors to review needs and set priorities, much in the fashion of the President's economic advisors.

I, personally, am inclined to doubt that any one proposal, although each is worthy of serious consideration, will be the panacea, will unify federal policy toward higher education. Each proposal in itself contains the risk of substituting arbitrary standards or unitary authority which could do grave damage to the widely diversified interest of our country's colleges and universities.

In my own opinion, the higher education community must therefore look to itself to determine its role amid the competing demands from outside. I would echo Clark Kerr's words: "The really new problems of today and tomorrow may lend themselves less to solutions by external authority; they may be inherently problems for internal resolution. The university may now again need to find out whether it has a brain as well as a body."

This brings us to the theme which John Gardner first spelled out two years ago. Secretary Gardner voiced the belief "that we are immunizing a high proportion of our most gifted young people against any tendencies to leadership." He went on to make this indictment: "For a good many academic and other professional people, negative attitudes toward leadership go deeper than skepticism concerning the leader's integrity. Many have real doubts, not always explicitly formulated, about the necessity for leadership."

I think this is an important starting point for higher education as it looks to the problems of leadership within its own community. As Mr. Gardner pointed out, this does not mean returning to earlier notions of social organization. There is no need for despotism of university presidents or administrators to serve the role of leadership. But it does mean there is need for an effective power structure capable of governing that ideal community of rational men and women which calls itself the university. Such a power structure must be capable of consensus; but it also must be capable of invention, of innovation, of responding to and helping to shape the patterns of change.

My own impression is that too many of the rituals and routines of the university are not subject to the same critical examination which the academicians devote to others. There is little evidence that modern concepts or modern technology utilized by other large-scale organizations have been applied to the university's use of its own resources. I certainly do not mean to suggest that the computer can tell you how much time it takes to write a book or teach an idea, but surely the uses of organized intelligence that have been developed with the help of the universities have some application to the problems of the universities themselves.

I know I am venturing into sensitive territory. If the university should have "a brain as well as a body," the exercise of this critical faculty must inevitably impinge on the university's traditions. It may even conclude that feudalism is not the best arrangement among the departments. It will certainly need to say no as well as yes to enticements from outside. It will need to impose standards of judgment.

I believe that this capacity for leadership will find favor with those in government who rely on university services. James Webb, administrator of NASA, has often complained that he must purchase piecemeal the knowledge he needs. He tells me that he has failed to find a single university willing to take on the big problem which cuts across science, politics, economics, and other disciplines. The university, he says, just doesn't work that way.

But if the university did work that way, there could be benefits not only for government but for the scholar and the student preparing for a world in which narrow specialization has already reached the point of diminishing returns.

There is a risk, I realize, in suggesting that the higher education community examine its own leadership and determine its own role. For leadership can be forward- or backward-looking. The university which seeks to reclaim an image from the past or to retreat behind campus walls and make its garden grow will be sadly out of tune with the times. Tomorrow's university must be a place where no student can complete his studies without being exposed to the great unmet challenges; where no expert lacks opportunity to test his skills on issues that go beyond his discipline; where the scholar's purpose is to solve man's needs, not just to catalogue them; where the quest for knowledge pools the intellect and the imagination of many minds. For Woodrow Wilson's dictum that the school must be "of the nation" has taken on even greater urgency—only now a world dimension has been added.

Higher educational leadership in developing federal policies

PART
II
CHAPTER
3

STEPHEN K. BAILEY

EXACTLY ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO the U.S. House of Representatives considered a recommendation by the National Association of School Superintendents that a National Bureau of Education be established. In that same year this recommendation became law. What is now the U.S. Office of Education was established. The creation of the Office of Education was less important than the facts that the Congress reacted to a memorial from a professional association and that a former college president, Congressman James A. Garfield, was the effective sponsor of the enabling legislation.

Today higher education leadership has a profound effect upon the development of federal educational policies. Two out of four major elements of leadership influence are symbolized by the 1867 Act: national professional associations and individual educators in politics. A third element is official and unofficial consultancies and membership on advisory committees and panels. The fourth is research and writing.

Let us look briefly at each of these.

Washington is crowded with professional associations and lobbies of all kinds. There is a legal distinction here. A lobby is not tax-exempt. A professional association is, if its major activity is not lobbying. But the distinctions here are more apparent than real. In the policy area of higher education, organizations like the American Association for Higher Education, the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges have a powerful influence upon the initiation and course of legislation and upon policy implementation, regulation, and administration within relevant executive agencies. Both 1201 Sixteenth Street and 1785 Massachusetts Avenue are an integral part of the informal structure of federal policymaking where higher educational interests are concerned.

There is nothing evil or sinister about this. These professional associations attempt to be representative of the interests of a broad and important constituency. They have or can command expert knowledge about the real or perceived effect of federal policies upon higher education. Their advice is sought by the White House, by Congress, and by the executive departments and agencies. They are asked to testify on bills, to consult on guidelines, to share dreams, to contribute insights and proposals, to pass the concerns of their clientele on to appropriate officials and legislators, to act as channels of communication about governmental policies to their various constituencies. Group interests of this kind are both causes and effects of our freedom. No major bill affecting higher education has been passed or implemented within the past half century without consultation and advice from the professional associations of higher education. College and university professors and administrators rarely appreciate the protections and the services these associations provide in the formulation of public policy. They are on the front line of higher education leadership in developing federal policies.

A second form of higher education leadership is to be found among the educator-politicians and educator-public officials. Some of Congress' most distinguished champions of education have come from the higher education profession. And I should not want to neglect the distinguished personal and committee staff members and Congressional fellows who have come from college and university teaching and administration.

In the executive branch at both the political-executive and career service levels, scores of officials have entered government service from professional life in institutions of higher education. Many of these are specialists in the sciences or engineering or law. But many are directly involved in federal programs affecting higher education in a broader sense: in NASA, the Public Health Service, the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, and in the defense and foreign affairs establishments. Their past experience and their commitment to the improvement of higher education makes it possible for these quasi-academic types to perform an important leadership function in a variety of areas of federal policy-making.

In the broader sense, of course, the products of higher education dominate all three branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial. The days of Jacksonian democracy are long past—if in fact they ever existed. College and university-educated men and women run our entire governmental enterprise. They constitute the generic higher education leadership in the development of federal policies.

If we return to federal policies which directly affect higher education, increasing attention must be given to the participation of professors and educational administrators as advisors and consultants. Vice President Humphrey recently remarked that the academics found at any one time in the Washington National Airport would constitute a most prestigious institution of higher education. Scores of top-level advisory committees, hundreds of grant panels, and thousands of individual consultants are involved each month in the decisional process in Washington. A large proportion of these are made up of representatives from higher education. In addition, faculty and administrators of our colleges and universities are increasingly being turned out to help in technical assistance and institution building abroad.

Finally, of course, we academics write books and articles. A generation ago John Maynard Keynes wrote eloquently:

> Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Mad men in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back. I am sure . . . that the power of vested interests is vastly exaggerated compared with the gradual encroachment of ideas.

What Keynes said about economics is quite as relevant to all other fields—including education itself. What scholars write and academic dreamers dream is fraught with policy consequences. John Dewey, Alfred North Whitehead, Theodore Schultz, and James B. Conant—to name but two defunct and two living scholars out of hundreds—haunt the halls and offices of more federal buildings than most of us can imagine. The most pervasive and influential higher education leadership in developing federal policies comes from the academic scribblers. Their ideas permeate and interact, they corrode and subvert, until—to paraphrase William James—they "rend the hardest monuments of man's pride."

How successful has this leadership been?

On the positive side, the government has had the benefit of the experience and knowledge of the academic world on a variety of policy fronts. The success of a vast panoply of federal programs can be attributed in part to the brilliance and dedication of higher education leadership. For this we can as a nation be grateful and proud. But, unfortunately, the involvement of higher education leadership in the development of federal policy has not been an unmixed blessing. We have made mistakes of both omission and commission. We need to face these mistakes honestly and forthrightly, and we need to take steps to overcome or reduce them in the future.

Let me suggest three mistakes. They are parochialism, irrelevance, and irresponsibility. The first is an act of commission, the second an act of omission, the third both.

On the first, parochialism, higher education leadership has often been narrowly oriented and given over to segmental and special pleading. Harold Orlans' studies of the federal government and higher education suggest that one effect of federal grant-in-aid programs for higher education in recent years has been to warp the attention and private resources of colleges and universities towards science and technology at the expense of the social sciences and the humanities. The recent creation of the National Foundation on the Humanities, and the expansion of NSF grants to some areas of social science, have as yet done little to redress the imbalance. For most of the past decade higher education leadership has been virtually equivalent to scientific and technological leadership in the area of federal policy-making. The general and balanced needs of higher education have received inadequate attention and energy. Recent grants and loans have been more broadly gauged. But the nature of federal support for higher education is still lumpy, and too often reflects the parochial interests of specific academic departments, disciplines, divisions, levels, and professional schools rather than the interests of higher education as a whole. These parochial approaches not only strengthen parts of higher education vis-à-vis the whole; they tend to exacerbate intra- and interagency parochialisms within the government itself. It has been argued that universities and the federal government are the last two remaining strongholds in our society of free competitive enterprise. Free competition for grants and contracts for subdivisions of higher education may have its advantages, but it can also produce untoward and dangerous results. It can denigrate undergraduate teaching, warp curricula, produce stockpiles of mediocre researches, and tear faculties apart in a wild game of academic gamesmanship and overseasmanship. In some cases, it can promote immoral bookkeeping and budgeting. It can create gross inequities in salary and status. Both colleges and universities on the one hand, and the federal government on the other, need mechanisms and commitments to view the end and means of higher education as a whole, and to help re-establish universities out of the disarranged multiversities of our time.

On the subject of irrelevance I must tread with care. Not all of academic activity should be policy-oriented or service-oriented to the immediate needs of the federal government. It is possible that there is already too much of this kind of thing. The fundamental responsibilities of higher education should be largely inner-directed. But theory and empirical data need not be irrelevant to the problems of mankind in order to meet the exalted canons of scholarship. Academic theory in science and technology have benefited from contract research and sponsored investigations. In the social sciences, parts of economics possibly excepted, much of our theory and model building has been recondite, nonadditive, and atrociously expressed. We wobble uncertainly between expressing obvious truths in obscure languages and symbols, on the one hand, and constructing elaborate and complicated theories which are too general and too elaborate to have operational relevance, on the other. To make social science relevant to the needs of federal policy-makers, we need to do far more with what the psychologists have termed "theorettes"—middle-range generalizations which do not pretend to encompass the whole truth, but which do establish operationally relevant regularities of utility to students and policy-makers alike. Across the board in higher education we need to develop specialists who are capable of conversations with nonspecialists—who have the knack of making nonuseful knowledge useful.

All too often, in dealing with the federal government, higher education has seemed to want freedom and power without responsibility. We want the license and the money to discover, to experiment, and to invent without any thought for the social implications and consequences of our endeavors. We want to receive financial subventions for our research and then unlimited rights to exploit our discoveries for our own individual financial gain. We want government money without having to conform to government standards and systems of accountability. This, fortunately, is not true of all of us; but it is true of enough of us to have created considerable cynicism within federal donor agencies about the purity of our academic motives. We have learned all of the political arts of log-rolling, special pleading, lobbying, and wheeling and dealing. Once we are successful in grantsmanship, however, we often draw around us a cloak of self-righteousness and even arrogance—sometimes unscrupulously marked academic freedom. This is not to argue that we do not need protections from certain kinds of political control and interference. It is to argue that freedom involves responsibility, and that we cannot legitimately escape from processes of public accountability if we are to accept public largesse. We must attempt to work out within our institutions of higher education, and with the government, a series of protocols which will preserve our rights to responsible inquiry at the same time that broader public interests are recognized and acknowledged. To put the matter in its most extreme form, if a government grant helps a scientist develop a new and lethal gas, the scientist has no license to sell his invention for private profit to an enemy nation. This may be obvious; but there are a whole series of less apocalyptic issues involving the government and the scholar which must be handled by patient and sympathetic negotiations rather than by assumptions of academic license and autonomy.

Higher education leadership is needed in developing federal policies. Such leadership is presently active. If the long-range interests of the universities and of the citizenry as a whole are to be protected, such leadership must become increasingly general in its orientation; it must become increasingly relevant; it must become increasingly responsible.

How can a legislator become an educational leader?

PART
II
CHAPTER
4

ALBERT H. QUIE

THE LATE ADLAI STEVENSON SUGGESTED that the goal of education should be one of teaching "Western man not just to survive, but to triumph; not just to defend himself, but to make man and the world what God intended them to be."

With Ambassador Stevenson's articulate definition serving as a frame of reference, I should like to raise several questions and offer some thoughts by way of partial response. If we accept the comprehensive view of education enunciated by Mr. Stevenson, then we must accept the conclusion that there are roles in education for those who are no longer active participants in the formal educational setting of the classroom. Both Commissioner Harold Howe and his predecessor Francis Keppel have stated that "education is much too important to be left to educators." What, then, is the role that the legislator can play in the educational process? Is his role passive or active in contributing to that end that man and the world become what God intended them to be?

Before we can explore the opportunities—and the responsibilities—of the legislator as an educator, we must first examine and understand his duties as a lawmaker. Many Congressional scholars suggest that most Congressmen view their duties in terms of three major functions. First, members must participate actively in the work of the committees to which they are assigned. Second, they must take care of their constituents by responding to their individual requests. Third, they must be constantly alert to the issues and the opposition that they may face—and the image that they will present—in their bid for re-election.

Over and above the duties of legislating, serving constituents, and testing the political winds, many lawmakers feel that they have an opportunity to be educational spokesmen. In many respects, the educational role that a member elects to play—that is, his decision to exert a positive influence on the thinking of his constituents—is determined in large measure by the way in which he views his relationship with his constituency. Is his legitimate role one of leading his constituency, or is it one of reflecting the mood of that constituency?

While we find no definite lines of demarcation, I think that we do find evidence to support this hypothesis: among those Senators and Representatives who demonstrated active leadership qualities—those who actively involved themselves in influencing or leading their people—we find our greatest number of educator-legislators. Our legislators who became educational leaders considered it an integral part of their duty and a responsibility to enlighten their people on those issues that would vitally affect man's future in a complicated human world.

And to those who elect this activist leadership role, the world of the Congressman contains resources that most classroom educators would envy. Direct and personal contact—and the rapport that may be thereby established—are among the Congressman's most valuable tools for educating the voter. The constituent who visits the member's Washington office is really interested. He is genuinely seeking, and expects to have his Congressman share with him, his thoughts on a particular issue. And these are just a few compared to the number a member reaches when he speaks to special groups. There is one regrettable aspect of this direct personal contact: there is simply not enough time to develop it fully as an opportunity for understanding and enlightenment. Surely, it is a medium for which no one has found a satisfactory substitute. In view of the demands made on me, I know that I could spend all of my time in my Congressional district. But even if I could disregard the other demands that are made and devote my entire day and my full attention to cultivating this relationship, the impact would still be limited. And so we must rely on other means of communication in our efforts to serve and to educate the electorate. The constituent who writes to his Congressman or Senator on a particular matter is seeking information and deserves an early, honest, and informative reply. While it is a less ideal educational medium than the free and spontaneous exchange of ideas that may come out of a face-to-face meeting, the correspondence between the member and the letter-writer is nonetheless a broad avenue for a meaningful and rewarding exchange.

Within recent years, more and more Congressmen have employed the Congressional newsletters as a sounding board for their views. Through news releases, radio and television, the distribution of materials on as unlimited a range of subjects as there are human interests, and the acceptance of invitations to address assemblies, the Congressman may exert a powerful, constructive, and positive influence on the thinking of his constituency. As the legislators' world contains a vast number of assets for educational leadership, so it brings them in close working relationship with a cross-section of men and women who are not generally viewed as educators or teachers. Influenced by contacts with the White House staff, with heads of executive departments and independent agencies, with veteran and freshman colleagues alike, with members of the press, membership in the Congress affords one a unique experience for an ongoing exchange of ideas—an exchange that transforms a political institution into a superior institution for higher education.

If a Congressman's environment contains such a great potential for leadership in education, why, you may query, don't all Congressmen or more Congressmen choose to become educational leaders? Could it be that the antileadership vaccine that Secretary Gardner believes is "immunizing a high proportion of our most gifted young people against any tendencies to leadership" is also immunizing a high percentage of the adult community? Is it immunizing a high proportion of our national legislators against any tendencies to assume that educational leadership role for which they are so ideally equipped?

We must never forget that the legislator is a political animal. And there may well be a set of conditions of life in the world of politics that is not conducive to the emergence of true leaders. This set of conditions takes the form of conflicting pressures exerted from without on the legislator—pressures which, when combined with his personal assessment of his duties and responsibilities, play an important part in determining the extent to which he attempts to influence and educate his electorate. To those who seek to form a vanguard to promote public understanding and acceptance of those ideas that may work to alleviate man's age-old problems, the road is long and difficult.

The Senator or Representative who seizes the initiative and exhibits leadership qualities—particularly in controversial or emotion-ridden areas where his convictions do not coincide with those of a number of his colleagues, and of a large number of major voter blocs in his district—runs the risk of jeopardizing his future political career. While he may sympathize with the views held by local or sectional interests, he may have acquired a broader understanding of the issues and what the national or public interest requires; and this understanding may dictate a course of action divergent from that which the majority would have him pursue. Does he ignore or defy the many pressures that are brought to bear by his party, his colleagues, organized voter groups, and his electorate, and follow that avenue along which his convictions, his understanding of the issues, and his concept of what is in the best public interest would lead him? To what extent does he engage in the art of compromise? Or should he avoid any risk to his political future by announcing paradoxically, "There go the people; I must follow them, for I am their leader"?

Some of our outstanding educator-legislators accepted this risk, succeeded in winning over public sentiment and support, and were returned to office again and again. Some were chastised by the electorate, later to be vindicated and returned to Congress. Others had their Congressional membership revoked and are remembered now and then as profiles in courageous leadership. Many were forced into an early retirement—denied further access to any national forum for education—with the nation, in turn, being denied the rewards of their foresight and wisdom. Clearly, the risks to a long political career may work against the rising legislator who would be an educator-legislator.

I think that today's young people may be demonstrating—in larger numbers and more articulately and more forcefully—those antileadership qualities that have become strong threads woven throughout the American social pattern.

Writer Bergen Evans argued along these lines when he said: "Legislators who are of even average intelligence stand out among their colleagues. Many Governors and Senators have to be seen to be believed. A cultured college president has become as much a rarity as a literate newspaper publisher. A financier interested in economics is as exceptional as a labor leader interested in the labor movement. For the most part our leaders are merely following out front; they do not marshal as to the way that they are going."

If the American legislator is no longer viewed as an educator—in broad terms—the blame rests partly on his shoulders. All too often legislators have defaulted in meeting the expectations, in accepting the responsibilities, and in living up to the hopes and the standards that the electorate had established for them. In short, the legislator seems to have failed them in their eyes and, as a consequence, they are disillusioned, disenchanted, and disdainful of him. The image that the "politician" conveys—and the legislator is a politician—is a tarnished one. His public image has suffered, and the respect which he might have been accorded as a leader and as an educator has suffered too.

But the legislator does not shoulder the full responsibility or blame for his plight. The American electorate too must share in the burden of blame. For our society rejects the bold voices of leadership—unless those voices echo their own sentiments and conform to the popular opinions of the day, regardless of how inconsistent and fluctuating they may be.

With tongue in cheek, former Alabama solon Luther Patrick complained that the American voter looks to his Congressman as "an expanded messenger boy, an employment agency; getter-outer of the Navy, Army, Marines; ward heeler, wound healer, troubleshooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, gladhand extender, business promoter, civic ills skirmisher, veterans' affairs adjuster, ex-servicemen's champion, watchdog for the underdog, sympathizer with the upperdog, namer of babies, recoverer of lost baggage, soberer of delegates; binder of broken hearts, financial wet nurse, good Samaritan, contributor to good causes—there are so many good causes—cornerstone layer, building and bridge dedicator, and ship christener."

Unfortunately, taking tongue out of cheek, this is the role in which many voters envision their Representative and Senator. If this be the current consensus of the legislator's role, then I would raise this question: can a legislator become an educational leader, exercising his mature judgment and unceasing efforts to serving his nation in such a way that man may not just survive, but triumph; not just defend himself, but make man and the world what God intended them to be?

How can the educational community be sure that there are members of legislative decision-making bodies who not only will understand its problems, but who also will assume an active role in working toward the enactment of legislation that will meet the needs and achieve the goals that have been spelled out? How can the educational community be certain that there are legislators who will assume an active role in pioneering new ideas and programs and in building greater public support for these ideas and programs? This is no simple task. Legislators who are educational leaders are not born and do not mature in a day. They must be groomed and promoted by those within the educational community, and this can be done by encouraging men and women who are at present in the field of education to broaden their interests and activities and become active and respected civic leaders, spokesmen, and eventually political activists. Currently, some of our most competent educator-legislators are drawn from the ranks of the classroo[illegible]

The fact that we don't have more educator-legislators may be attribute[illegible] partially to a failure on the part of the nation's educational community to recruit actively promising potential legislative talent. While formal training in the field of education is valuable, it does not necessarily guarantee one a leadership post. I believe that a continuing interest in this nation's educational needs and goals is an even greater factor. The educational community must, therefore, devote more and more of its time and efforts to a concerted campaign to bring outstanding and interested civic leaders of today—many of whom will be the legislators of tomorrow—into the educational fold. Civic leaders and future legislators must be wooed and welcomed and made aware of the myriad needs and problems that confront the profession and the nation. Moreover, they must be made familiar with the day-to-day workings and operations of local educational institutions. Again, those in the educational community must take the initiative. A meaningful and continuing rapport may be established in a variety of ways. Invitations to conferences, symposiums, meetings, and conventions to be held in the area should be extended to local, state, and national political and civic leaders. All too often these professional meetings—and the exchanges of ideas that take place—are limited to those in the education field who are already aware of the problems and needs. What results is that they are merely convincing themselves that they have urgent needs and critical problems. But this they know well. The task, therefore, becomes one of promoting a broader understanding on the part of a larger cross-section of the community, and of creating a milieu which includes genuine understanding that can be translated into strong public support for the programs set forth to meet the needs and realize the goals of the profession and those whom it serves.

Civic and political leaders should be invited to give their assistance to projects in which the education profession is involved and vitally interested. Whether or not the forthcoming advice and assistance is as valuable as that which educators per se might render may be doubtful to some. In the long run, however, the returns that will be reaped from this type of interaction may be of more use than originally anticipated—for educators are establishing a better working relationship and promoting a more genuine understanding on the part of those in the community who are and will be in a position to exert influence upon and to determine the fate of many of the programs in which they have a keen and vested interest. Those leaders whose participation has been encouraged cannot help but be sympathetic to and aware of the needs that educators feel are most pressing.

Our institutions of higher learning might establish a rotating chair for a legislator in residence. This could serve a dual purpose. Not only would the legislator in residence have a first-hand opportunity to gain a personal familiarity with the institution of which he is now a part, and an understanding of its immediate and long-term needs and goals and those of similar institutions, but also the faculty and the administration could tap the expertise and seek the advice of the legislator who is in a position to know the host of factors and the many trends that will influence local, state, and national educational policies and programs. This type of relationship is a mutually beneficial one; educators develop an intimate friendship with members of the legislative decision-making body—a friendship that extends beyond the one that usually exists between the representatives or lobbyists of education associations and members of a legislative body. The rewards of this type of relationship will be far more numerous than those of one that finds a professional group taking a sudden short-term interest in a legislator because it feels that its interests may be jeopardized or threatened by an upcoming vote in the legislature.

For those who would be legislative leaders in the field of education, membership on a committee that may shape the final course of educational policies and programs is very important. In the House, for example, jurisdiction over educational programs resides in a wide number of committees. Since jurisdiction over educational legislation is widely diffused, the potential opportunities for an educator-legislator in the House to serve on a committee that influences some facet of educational legislation are numerous.

What is more, those who would be leaders in the field of education have a responsibility to develop expertise in this area through discussion, through what seems to be endless reading and serious study, and through association and exchange of ideas with others in the field. All of these will help the potential educational leader to broaden his outlook and crystallize his own thinking. He should be able to subscribe to and advocate certain ideas or philosophies around which he can then work to rally a broad base of support. In a word, he must take a stand. If he is a Democrat, he may support anything that the Administration proposes. If he is a Republican, he may automatically oppose anything that the Administration sponsors and back all of his party's proposals. Or he may support only those measures in which his constituency has registered a strong interest. Then again, he may look to the NEA or comparable groups for guidance in his thinking. To limit himself to any one of these approaches is somewhat short-sighted.

Rather, he must draw upon all of these sources of insight and develop a philosophy in which he sincerely believes and which he can honestly say he feels to be one that realizes our commitment to the principle that all of our young people should be able to attain their full intellectual potential. One final point is in order. With a position on an education committee and with seniority on such a committee, a member is looked to more and more as a leader. His advice and counsel are eagerly sought and his public forum is extended so that his thinking is able to influence a larger constituency—one that may become truly a national constituency.

The educational community needs the active leadership and support of those in the legislative branches at all levels of government activity. It will not enjoy this support as a matter of course. Support must be carefully cultivated and nurtured among men and women who have the talent and the wisdom to be responsible and enlightened leaders. The process of developing legislators who will be educational leaders is not an easy one, for the educational community must vie with an ever-growing number of other organized groups for the attention and the interest of these potential leaders. Whether or not the education profession and community have leaders who are truly educational leaders will depend in large measure on the success with which they counter the immunization effects of the antileadership vaccine of which Secretary Gardner has spoken. This vaccine, I maintain, has not only immunized a high proportion of our young people against any tendencies to leadership, but is also keeping a high percentage of those within legislative bodies and within the educational community itself from accepting the responsibilities, the challenges, and the risks that are a part of any leadership role in our society.

PART III

APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP

PART
III
CHAPTER
1

Dynamics of leadership

JACK R. GIBB

PEOPLE MUST BE LED. People perform best under leaders who are creative, imaginative, and aggressive—under leaders who lead. It is the responsibility of the leader to marshall the forces of the organization, to stimulate effort, to capture the imagination, to inspire people, to coordinate efforts, and to serve as a model of sustained effort.

The leader should keep an appropriate social distance, show no favorites, control his emotions, command respect, and be objective and fair. He must know what he is doing and where he wants to go. He must set clear goals for himself and for the group or institution, and then communicate these goals well to all members of the organization. He must listen for advice and counsel before making decisions. But it is his responsibility to make decisions and to set up mechanisms for seeing that the decisions are implemented. After weighing the facts and seeking expert counsel, he must make policy and rules, set reasonable boundaries, and see that these are administered with justice and wisdom, even compassion.

The leader should reward good performance and learn effective ways of showing appreciation. He must be equally ready to give negative criticism where warranted and to appraise performance frequently, fairly, and unequivocally. He must command strong discipline, not only because people respect a strong leader, but because strength and firmness communicate care and concern. Good leadership requires good followship. People tend to follow good leaders. Leaders are born. Methods of election and selection are thus very important. Finding the right chairman or president is the critical variable in the success of a program or an institution. The quality of an organization is often judged by the perceived quality of the leadership.

The above is an oversimplified statement of one view of leadership theory and practice. A similarly oversimplified statement of an alternative viewpoint follows below.

People grow, produce, and learn best when they set their own goals, choose activities that they see as related to these goals, and have a wide range of freedom of choice in all parts of their lives. Under most conditions persons are highly motivated, like to take responsibilities, can be trusted to put out a great deal of effort toward organizational goals, are creative and imaginative, and tend to want to cooperate with others.

Leadership is only one of several significant variables in the life of the group or the institution. Leaders *can* be helpful and often are. The most effective leader is one who acts as a catalyst, a consultant, and a resource to the group. His job is to help the group to grow, to emerge, and to become more free. He serves the group best when he is a whole person, is direct, real, open, spontaneous, permissive, emotional, and highly personal. The leader at his best is an effective member. He acts in such a way as to facilitate group strength, individual responsibility, diversity, nonconformity, and aggressiveness. The leader is thus not necessary to the group and quickly becomes replaceable, dispensable, and independent. The good leader tends not to lead. He permits, feels, acts, relates, fights, talks—acts human as do other members of the group and the institution. The leader is present, available, and with the group *as a person,* not as a role.

We find many shades and variations of each of these two oversimplified statements of the theory and practice of leadership in our society. Several years of consulting and research in representative organizations make it very clear to me that attitudes toward leadership tend to cluster around these two poles. This bifurcation has analogues in current educational theory, politics, religion, philosophy, and administration.

The first view, described variously as authoritarian, paternalistic, or conservative, I classify as defensive because dynamically the view defends the administrator against his own fears and distrusts and against perceived or anticipated attack from the outside.

This authoritarian or defensive view is particularly appropriate to some viable aspects of the culture we live in: to organizational forms inherited from the medieval church and military; to a life of vertical hierarchy, prescribed role responsibilities, and delegated authority; to a highly competitive economic and educational system; to the current dominant values of efficiency, excellence, productivity, task performance, and perfectionism; to the impersonality, alienation, loneliness, impotence and indifference in our people; to a world of automation, programing, data processing, and engineering; to a forensic, persuasive, public relations, and marketing mode of interpersonal commerce; to a world continually at war, threatened by war, or preparing for war; in short, to a world of machines. It is not accidental that all around the country when administrators administer the ultimate forensic weapon in arguing against participative forms of leadership they say, "But it would never work in the military or on the production line." Actually, research indicates that this point is probably not true, but in any event the image of the leaders of our educational and governmental institutions using as a reference point for administrative theory the demands of the military organization and the production line is at least disconcerting.

It seems to me equally clear that defensive leadership is highly inappropriate and perhaps even fundamentally dissonant with another viable side of the world we live in: with education for growth, intimacy, authenticity, humanness, and creativity; with the Judeo-Christian ethics of love, honesty, intimacy, faith, cheek-turning, and brotherhood; with a climate for research, inquiry, scholarship, contemplation, and learning; with cooperation, group planning, team building, and various successful forms of group effort; with the new emerging models of industrial organization and manufacturing productivity; with what might be thought of as the behavioral science approach to organizational productivity and organizational change; with the world of ambiguity, feeling, conflict, sorrow, creativity, and diversity; with many new and exciting developments in education, architecture, the creative arts, economics, management, and all phases of modern life; in short, with the world of human beings, with people.

I have deliberately drawn sharp and oversimplified distinctions in a problem area which is very complex and legitimately polemic. It is essential today that those who are administratively responsible for the colleges and universities of America see clearly this conflict and its implications for all facets of American life. It is my observation that much of the dysfunctional disturbance that the papers report daily from the college campuses is created as unintended but inevitable effects of defensive leadership practices among administrators of American colleges.

Let us look at the dynamics of defensive leadership. The major dynamic of the defensive model is fear and distrust. Observations indicate that people who have mild or more serious fears tend to do several things: distrust the people being led; filter the data that are given to the followers and develop strategies for such filtering and programing of data dissemination; attempt to control and manipulate the motivations of the followers; and attempt to control their behavior. The incidence and degree of low trust, strategic, persuasional, and controlling behavior varies directly with the amount of fear. Most of us who are leaders or are placed in leadership roles have varying degrees of fear about our own adequacy, how we are seen by others, the effectiveness of our leadership strategies, the effects of rebellion, the anxieties about insubordination and other unfollowerlike behavior. I guess that our major fear has to do with anxiety about being followed!

The behavior of leaders tends to camouflage, perhaps even to themselves, the underlying fears which support the strategic, manipulative, and controlling behavior. For images of fear on assuming leadership roles one has but to think of the new teacher in the schoolroom, the new mother bringing back her first baby from the hospital, the new lieutenant guiding a patrol into action, or the newly appointed administrative official handling a student riot. The fears that we all have are quelled and softened by various adaptive, self-deceptive, and façade-building mechanisms for presenting ourselves to ourselves and to others.

Some educational leaders are today more fearful than ever. In reaction to student strikes, riots, demonstrations, and protests, as well as to the more normal vicissitudes of campus life, college and university leaders utilize defensive practices that generate unintended byproducts of fear, distrust, hostility, and counter-defensive behavior. The classical models of leadership are time and again proved to be ineffective. Why does defensive leadership arise and persist among educational leaders?

A reciprocal or circular process seems to be operating. Normal fears of life are exacerbated by the ambiguity, high control, and threat of the group or organization. However necessary this ambiguity and control is thought to be, it serves to create fears and hostilities which in turn call forth still more restrictive ambiguity and controlling behavior. This reciprocal fear-distrust cycle sustains the defensive behavior of leadership. The fears accompany and reinforce feelings of inadequacy and self-rejection in leaders and other members of the group or organization.

But the fears, hostilities, and distrusts are so successfully camouflaged in the social defenses that the casual observer might well think the above description of educational life to be strangely out of touch with reality as he sees it. Certainly it is not the conscious intent of educational leaders to create such a state of affairs.

Why is it then that we get in the university so many unintended effects? These unintended effects seem to result from a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy: low-trust, high-fear theories, when put into practice, actually generate distrust and fears that not only confirm the assumptions underlying the theories, but also provide emotional support and strong motivation to continue the low-trust, high-fear behavior. An interactive and self-preserving cycle is thus set in motion, supported in depth by latent fear-distrusts and by rationalized theories which appear to be confirmed. Leadership behavior, thus supported, is exceedingly difficult to change.

Behind the façade of paternalism, politeness, one-big-happy-family-living, heartiness, and the accompanying soft-sell influence and velvet-glove control lie defensive relationships that pervade the colleges. Defensive leadership is characterized by low trust, data distortion, persuasion, and high control. These four aspects of defensive leadership are parallel to four basic dimensions of all group or social behavior: the feeling climate, the flow of data within the system, the formation of goals, and the emergence of control.

The key to defensive leadership is a state of low trust. The defensive leader assumes that the average person cannot be trusted, he is essentially lazy and irresponsible, action must be taken to inspire and motivate him, and he requires supervision and control. The defensive leader can counteract his feelings of inferiority by assuming that his subordinates are less than they actually are; and he can service his hostile feelings by keeping the subordinate in demeaning, dependent, and inferior roles in relation to himself and to leadership as a class.

The defensive leader or administrator rationalizes the service of his needs by developing formal or informal leader theories which both justify and camouflage his fears and hostilities. An essential step in theory and in practice is to manipulate the flow of information and communication within the organization. Information sent down from the top is often deliberately "corrected" to increase morale, to allay fears, to put the best administrative foot forward, and to justify administrative action. "Correction" is achieved by consciously or unconsciously filtering and distorting information to present a good image, to encourage positive thinking, or to build loyalty.

Strategies are devised to improve the administrative image: a worker's name is remembered to make him feel good; a birthday file is kept to demonstrate that the administrator feels the subordinate is important enough to warrant a birthday card. The "good" administrator is especially careful to smile acceptingly at those members of the "family" team towards whom he has temporary or sustained feelings of animosity. Interpersonal cues are thus manipulated and distorted to present a facade of warmth, friendliness, or cohesiveness.

The defensive leader is continually challenged to create new prods, rewards, and gimmicks as the old ones become ineffective. Thus the responsibility for sustaining motivations is thrust upon the administrator or teacher rather than upon the student. The inherent impetus to derive self-satisfaction and self-respect through accomplishment for its own sake becomes atrophied and lost. Self-satisfaction becomes dysfunctional as an incentive system.

The person who is being motivated by others through extrinsic rewards tends either to resist being influenced or to come under the control of the rewarder. He is motivated, not to achieve something, but to gain the approval of the teacher or administrator, to hunt for his satisfactions in status, grade, and social approval rather than to look for his satisfactions *within*, in terms of self-respect, self-approval, and the achievement of personal goals.

Thus the roots of dependence and apathy lie in the reward system, for the person who learns to find his values from without is always at the mercy of other persuaders—teachers, companions, demagogues, groups, or other sources of approval and authority. He becomes dependent, passive, and susceptible to all sorts of external controls.

The reward system may in others foster resistance and rebellion, resentment, cynicism, and a variety of negative and competitive feelings. People who work under competition learn to be competitive, and the extrinsic rewards do not satisfy the deep needs for self-satisfaction and self-respect which are gained by achieving our personal goals as unique individuals.

Both dependency and resistance require controls, and the defensive leader expends a considerable amount of energy devising a variety of controls both for the people and for the processes of the enterprise. The more fearful and anxious he is, the more he feels caught in recurring emergencies and the greater is his need to control. Regulations are put on car-parking, coffee-break duration, channels of reporting, library schedules, methods of work, habits of dress, use of safety devices, more and more complex filing systems, rigid report systems—until all aspects of living in the organization are controlled.

The conscious and official reasons given for the controls usually relate to organization and productive efficiency, but the underlying impulses often spring from, or are reinforced by, the leader's personal needs for rigid order or needs to demonstrate his superiority and strength, express hostility, exercise power, justify his position ("What else would I do if I didn't plan these controls?"), reinforce hierarchy, force people to be orderly or conforming, and keep them in line.

Control systems become functionally autonomous—traditional and conventional elements of the organizational system—and often outlive any practical utility. Indeed, people seem to sense that many regulations actually serve personal needs for punishment or power and bear little relation to the actual needs of the organization itself. In looking at organizations we have often found that many controls are universally violated in the system by common consent. In fact, there is clear indication—and often conscious awareness—that some controls are so dysfunctional that if everyone obeyed them the system would come to a grinding halt.

These defensive techniques of leadership produce certain predictable results. Fear and distrust beget fear and distrust. People who are distrustful tend to see untrustworthy behavior in others. If the relationship between an administrator and his subordinate is basically one of distrust, almost any action on either's part is perceived by the other as untrustworthy. Thus a cycle is created which nurtures self-corroborating leadership hypotheses.

This cycle is well illustrated in connection with communications. Any restriction of the flow of information and any closed strategy arouses energy devoted to circumventing the strategy and fosters counter-strategies that are at least as imaginative and often more effective than the original inducing strategy. A familiar example is the strategy of countering the top brass by distorting the upward-flowing data: feelings of hostility are camouflaged by deferential politeness; reports are "fixed up"; records are doctored or "cooked" to fit administrative goals and directives. Such attempts are augmented by emergency and threat; the greater the fear and distrust, the greater the circumvention, counter-strategy, and counter-distortion.

Defensive leaders use various forms of persuasion to motivate subordinates towards the organization's goals, but often the results are either apathy and passivity or frenetic conformity. Persuasion is a form of control and begets resistance, which may take many subtle forms. Open and aggressive cold war between teachers and administrators, for instance, is an obvious form. More common—and less easy to deal with—is passive, often unconscious resistance such as apathy, apparent obtuseness, dependent demands for further and more minute instructions, bumbling, wheel-spinning, and a whole variety of inefficiencies that reduce creative work.

As we have seen, tight control leads to some form of dependency and its accompanying hostility; it may vary from the yes man's deference and conformity to the no man's rebellion against even the most reasonable and normal requests and rules. Deference and rebellion are cut from the same cloth. When unnecessary and arbitrary controls are imposed, or when normal controls are seen as unnecessary or arbitrary, as is the case when there is fear and distrust, then almost all members of the hierarchy become concerned with their feelings about authority. Most of us are ambivalent toward authority figures, and these mixed feelings are augmented in periods of stress and fear. In tightly controlled, disciplining, and disciplined organizations members demand clarity in rules and in boundary demarcations. But rules can never be made completely clear in practical work situations; boundaries are always permeable and inadequately defined. Thus the demands for further clarification are endless, and controls lead to further controls.

We see how the cycle is set up: hostility and its inevitable counterpart, fear, are increased by the distrust, distortion, persuasion-reward, and control systems of defensive leadership; and the continuing cycle is *reinforced* at all stages, for as fear breeds distrust, distrust is rationalized and structured into theories which sanction distrustful leadership practices. The practices reinforce distrust; now the theorist is justified, and latent motivation to continue the cycle is itself reinforced.

Defensive leadership theories and practices permeate our society. We find them in the home, in school, and in the church, as well as in business organizations. Let us see, for instance, how the child-rearing patterns of our culture fit the picture described above. There are so many frightening things in the world that can harm helpless children. The fearful person can, with little effort, find a variety of frightening aspects in the environment of the child—anything from matches and electric outlets to busy roads and unacceptable playmates. Anxiety makes it easy to exaggerate the number of people ready to kidnap and even rape one's child; the fears of the parent embellish natural dangers and provide nourishment and comforting rationalization for defensive practices.

Communications must be managed for the good of the child. Because he might be worried or upset, emotional and financial discord must be camouflaged and a facade of security and serenity maintained. Children are inexperienced and immature, therefore they cannot be trusted to do things on their own. Moreover, since the natural interests of the child are likely to be frivolous, demeaning, or harmful, he should be carefully guided and persuaded to do what is right—to select appropriate playmates, read good books, and generally adopt goals set by the parental culture or aspirations. To protect the child from ubiquitous dangers and to set his feet on the proper path, parents readily learn to use bribes, praise, and deprivation as tools of coercion. And because children are initially dependent and helpless, it is easy for the fearful parent to prolong the period of dependency.

Schools reinforce these patterns. They receive children whose dependency has been created by defensive parental techniques, and they maintain the dependency by continuing these practices. Having been distrusted, children continue to be untrustworthy. The insecure teacher finds it necessary to maintain a protective façade; she rationalizes her behavior by making a number of low-trust, tight-control assumptions about the children under her tutelage. She builds a changing repertoire of tricks to keep them busy, orderly, neat, attentive, and—she hopes—motivated. Impressed by the awesome culture heritage she is charged to transmit, she feels it imperative that she instill in her pupils the goals, ideals, and rules of the culture. As bodies of knowledge become increasingly standardized, pressures towards indoctrination increase. By codifying rules, regulations, and standards, the teachers build internal control systems—in the classroom, and hopefully, in the children themselves. As part of the informal curriculum, children are taught façade-building; they are encouraged to put the best foot forward, to be polite, to be decorous, and to adopt the essentially hypocritical social graces of the dominant middle class.

What is the alternative to defensive leadership? This is not as easy to specify. The key to emergent leadership centers in a high degree of trust and confidence in people. Leaders who trust their colleagues and subordinates and have confidence in them tend to be open and frank, to be permissive in goal setting, and to be noncontrolling in personal style and leadership policy. People with a great deal of self-acceptance and personal security do trust others, do make trust assumptions about their motives and behavior. The self-adequate person tends to assume that others are also adequate and, other things being equal, that they will be responsible, loyal, appropriately work-oriented when work is to be performed, and adequate to carry out jobs that are commensurate with their levels of experience and growth.

Just as we saw that distrust arises from fear and hostility, so we can see that people with little fear and minimal needs to be hostile are ready to trust others. Of course, there is some risk in trusting others, in being open and freedom-giving.

People naturally tend to share their feelings and concerns with those whom they trust, and this is true at the simplest and most direct level of interpersonal relationships as well as at more complex levels of organizational communication. Thus a high-trust system may institute open planning meetings and evaluation meetings; public criteria for promotion; easily available information on salaries, cost figures, and budgets; and easy access to material in the files. There is comparatively little concern with public relations, with the corporate or family image, or with communications programs. Communication in such a system is a *process* rather than a program.

The participative leader is permissive in his relations with subordinates, for he assumes that as people grow they learn to assess their own aptitudes, discover their deep-lying interests, and develop their basic potentials. Therefore he gives his subordinates every opportunity to maximize self-determination and self-assessment, to verbalize their goals, to try new jobs or enlarge the scope of the work they are doing, and he trusts them to make mature judgments about job assignments. Where he is dealing with a work-team or a group, he lets the group make decisions about job allotments and work assignments.

This process of allowing people to be responsible for their own destinies, for setting their own targets, assessing their own development needs, searching out resources to aid in job accomplishment, and participating in setting organizational objectives is basic to high-trust leadership. Instead of using conventional defensive-leadership techniques of skilled persuasion to induce acceptance of leadership goals, the high-trust administration participates in cooperative determination of goals and in cooperative definition of production and staff problems. He knows that goal-formation is a significant skill that must be learned, and that to develop such skill students and adults must exercise a variety of opportunities to make decisions, explore goals, and experiment with many kinds of activities.

The participative administrator joins in creating a climate in which he has no need to impose controls. He knows that in a healthy group controls emerge from group processes as the need is perceived. Then controls are mediated by group or organization objectives and by such relevant data as deadlines and target dates. People or groups who have set their own objectives and have clearly stated their own goals build internal tension-systems which maintain goal orientation and create appropriate boundaries.

Formal and written rules about such things as work space, library use, and stockroom neatness are less and less necessary when people are engaged in a common task with others whose feelings and perceptions they freely share; when there is trust and mutuality, people are inclined to respect the rights and concerns of fellow members. This principle applies to large and small systems alike—in either, the participative administrator reduces as far as practicable all formal controls evidenced by rules, regulations, written memoranda, signs, formal job specification sheets, rigid lines of responsibility and authority, and the like.

The effects of participative leading are diametrically contrary to those of defensive leading. Love begets love. Respect begets respect. Trust produces trust. People who are trusted tend to trust themselves and to trust those in positions of responsibility. Moreover, the feeling that one is trusted encourages exploration, diversity, and innovation, for the person spends little time and energy trying to prove himself. His time and energy are freed to define and solve problems, accomplish work, and create new dimensions of his job. A fearful person uses a great deal of energy in defending himself against present or anticipated threat or attack; a confident and self-assured person can direct his energy towards goals that are significant to him as a person.

Again, openness begets openness. In the long run, at least, one who freely shares data, whether of feelings or of figures, reduces fear and distrust in himself and in others. Defensive administrators build massive communication programs, not to disseminate objective information but to mold attitudes, create favorable and appropriate images, and influence people. Such persuasional and distortive communication produces resistance. Direct and open flow of information, on the other hand, serves to create an atmosphere which encourages people to share information with those above as well as with those below.

In general, openness and information giving improves the decision-making process, for experience in giving information and expressing feelings enhances consensus; and the more nearly a group can reach consensus on operational issues, the higher the quality of the decision and the greater the group's commitment to the program.

Moreover, participative goal-formation optimizes self-determination and self-assessment. Intrinsic motivations become increasingly relevant and powerful. People explore their own capacities and interests, and try to find or create work for themselves that is satisfying and fulfilling. They enlarge their own jobs, asking for more responsibility and more creative and interesting work. Such work is fulfilling to the person, and extrinsic rewards are secondary to satisfaction in accomplishing the task. Administrators find that people like to work; they "own" their jobs and feel great loyalty and responsibility toward the common goals of the group. People feel little need to escape from the work situation, and the "thank goodness it's Friday" clubs become less enticing. Concerns over salary and merit increases are symptomatic of defensive-leading pressures.

Participative administration creates interdependence and diminishes the problem of authority. For instance, work is allocated by consensus—people assess their abilities and select or create appropriate tasks. Where there is interdependence, conflict and disagreement are openly expressed and can thus be resolved and integrated into productive work. Where people feel they are working together for a common goal, the organization of work can be flexible, diverse, and informal, with a minimum of written job boundaries and rigid role requirements. Channels of communication are free, open, and spontaneous.

The attainment of emergent leadership on the college campus is a developmental task of awesome proportion. If the above analysis of the leadership problem has some validity, then it is clear where some responsibilities lie.

These concepts particularly are a challenge to the university. The Ohio State studies, particularly, showed how far behind even the military and industry the university administration is in achieving some kind of more participative and less authoritarian administrative relationships. The headlines today are filled with conflicts. The university is in many ways more susceptible to the pressures which produce fear than is industry, government, or business. The university is at one and the same time vulnerable to attacks from public opinion and also historically inviolate. The products of the university are highly intangible, and it is difficult to apply vigorous controls to the product and to tell if the university is successful in the same way that a business or even the military is with its hard criteria for productivity, profit, or victory. Thus highly vulnerable, the university has preserved a historical isolation from social pressures; and administrative behavior is often strangely medieval and out of touch with the vigorous demands of democratic growth. The university, strangely, is sometimes a citadel for autocratic administrative behavior.

I should say a word about the implications of this model for ethical behavior. In abstract, this model of leadership specifies a theory of ethics. That behavior is more ethical when it is most trusting, most open, most self-determining, and most interdependent. Thus one would look in the university setting for unethical or moral behavior in the areas of distrust, strategic filtering of feelings and ideas (honesty), manipulative abridgement of self-determination, and dependency-producing or rebellion-producing high control behavior.

It seems to me that joint, interdependent, and shared planning is the central concept of the kind of participative, consultative leadership that we are considering. Planning, to be moral, in this framework, to be efficient, and to be growth-producing must be organic to the institution, involve to an optimal degree all of the participants, and must be done interdependently. It is easy to find illustrations on the university campus of buildings in architectural styles that are unrelated to experimental learning theory, fund-raising methods that are planned by a special group of people who are usually collecting funds in ways that would be anathema to other members of the college community, athletic programs that arise from financial need rather than from educational policy, personnel practices that are inherited unabashedly from business institutions that have aims that are incommensurate with university goals, and many other illustrations where planning is a fragmentary, emergency process engaged in by small groups of people who are often out of touch with the university as a community.

Our assumption is that the blocks to innovation and creativity are fear, poor communication, imposition of motivations, and the dependency-rebellion syndrome of forces. People are innovative and creative. The administration of innovation involves freeing the creativity that is always present. The administrative problem of innovation is to remove fear and increase trust, to remove strategic and distortional blocks to open communication, to remove coercive, persuasional, and manipulative efforts to pump motivation, and to remove the tight controls on behavior that tend to channel creative efforts into circumvention, counter-strategy, and organizational survival rather than into innovative and creative problem-solving.

Valid, direct, authentic, and open communication among all segments of the organic institution is a central process of effective leadership in the model we are examining. Effective leadership grows with communication in depth. Effective leadership is hampered by all forces which inhibit or restrain communication in depth. If emergent or participative leadership were prevalent on the campus, communication programs would become less and less necessary. Defensive administration breeds the conditions that require an increasing escalation of massive communication programs to hopefully alleviate the conditions produced by the defensive leadership.

We are attempting to *become* as a people and as culture. We are in the process of discovering and creating models of interdependent, high trust, self-determining, and open behavior. We are trying to create an interdependent, achieving, free, becoming culture. This has never before been done in the world, and the strains of transition are awesome and somewhat frightening. But for those of us who are dedicated to the university as a way of life, the challenge to the college and university administrator and leader is clear. The challenge is there. The road is unclear. The goal is at one and the same time the preservation of certain concepts we hold dear and the achievement of a more free, a more open, a more self-determining, and a more human environment for learning and growth.

Entrepreneurs, Mark II

PART
III
CHAPTER
2

HAROLD J. LEAVITT

THIS PAPER IS A PLEA for two related causes. First, it pleads for conscious, planned education for entrepreneurship. That does not mean it is a plea for bigger business schools, because business schools have not been educating entrepreneurs very much or very well, at least not lately. Second, it pleads for educational entrepreneurship—for entrepreneurial college presidents and faculties.

I am not, of course, alone in making this plea. A concern for entrepreneurship has been voiced before by economists, psychologists, and others. But it seems to me that in 1967 one form of leadership we need rather desperately is intelligent, hopefully moral entrepreneurship.

The themes of this paper are these. First, educators tend to denigrate entrepreneurship, and hence have tended either to suppress entrepreneurial tendencies in students or to let entrepreneurship happen independently of the realm of higher education. Hence, though we may still have lots of entrepreneurs we haven't developed highly skilled and educated ones. Second, entrepreneurs are needed. They are in short supply. They play a bridge-building role between new knowledge and its social exploitation and digestion. Third, we know something about how to identify entrepreneurial types, less about how to educate them, and even less about how to use them effectively. But if we in education put a little entrepreneurial effort into developing some schools for entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship, we may perform an almost vital social function.

This paper is a plea, then, not for conservation of one of our great natural resources, but for its active development. The resource in question is the entrepreneur—the promoter, the operator, the man who makes connections—a resource until now left largely in its wild state, never cultivated or developed, indeed rejected by much of academic society. If he were to become extinct, most educators would not have sense enough to mourn him; in fact, they would probably applaud or else never realize that the demise had occurred.

I submit that most of us, especially intellectuals, have indeed come to treat the entrepreneur as an untouchable; consciously or unconsciously we associate him with shadiness, self-centeredness, and expediency; a What-Makes-Sammy-Run kind of character; that is, if he makes it. If he fails, he is a tragicomic Death-of-a-Salesman sort of figure. But in either case, he isn't very respectable, certainly not the kind of person we ought to try to turn out of our universities. His values are wrong, his ethics often questionable. He may even skirt pretty close to the edge of the law; and he puts up fronts behind which there is very little substance. Moreover, he often fails.

Intellectuals are apt to dislike these characters for another reason altogether. Entrepreneurs, promoters, *machers* are associated with the march of materialism, with used car commercials and neon signs; with fins on automobiles and bigger and better mouthwashes; with the exploitation of material technology. And many intellectuals accept and digest material technology only under protest. We watch television only in the privacy of our bedrooms.

Despite all this, entrepreneurs are one kind of leader that we need more of. It is time for educators to reconsider their attitudes toward the entrepreneur; and indeed, to accept responsibility for breeding, domesticating, and to an extent emulating the species. We need him; we had better encourage him; and like Red China, we would do better to bring him into the society of reasonable men than to have him roving over the dark periphery of American society, seducing our children with shady new cereal commercials.

My argument rests more on the positive belief that the entrepreneurial role is a vital social role than on fear of the marauding entrepreneur. While he has indeed done some frightening things, the entrepreneur has also been a builder of social bridges; literally, he has been a carrier-between. Today's society needs intergroup bridges rather desperately.

What we really need is the white-hatted entrepreneur: the innovator, the relater, the developer, not the shady, expedient, unethical black-hatted fellow. Perhaps if we work at it we can develop such a new breed, though at the moment, in my observation, the two parts are not easily separable. But before trying to make that point any more explicit, let me elaborate upon our need for entrepreneurs—Mark II, if possible, rather than the old Mark I—and let me say why we in education ought to make a much more conscious effort to nurture them; and why it seems perfectly feasible to undertake such an effort within some subset of our institutions of higher education.

We need the entrepreneur for some obvious reasons. Technology is moving ahead faster than our ability to swallow it into our societies. Entrepreneurs are great aids to social swallowing. They specialize in getting people to swallow anything. They search for angles, for openings, for marriages. They can move things out of the technological laboratory into society. In fact, they have often done it. The spin-offs of major technological developments into socially useful products are, I submit, usually engineered by people with entrepreneurial attitudes, often selfishly motivated, often pretty junky, but nevertheless socially functional. Perhaps the entrepreneuring of programed education is a case close to home. We may wish for much greater speed. And much of the speed, I submit, derives from the happily continuing presence of the entrepreneurs. The race to exploit the area—by

IBM, General Electric, now Westinghouse and others—will not be won by all of them. Some undesirable things may happen, especially perhaps at the level of the little entrepreneur who has also jumped into the act.

You may agree that the instance of programed education and other educational innovations, like the creation of Parsons College, suggest that the entrepreneur is far from dead, and far from domesticated. But more seriously, because technology is running so rampant, and new knowledge is accumulating at so great a rate, we need entrepreneurs to make it possible for us to live with change, to mediate between society and technology. It is true that another alternative is to try to force a slowdown in technological innovation, but that seems an extremely unlikely and indeed unworthy possibility. Perhaps technology and technologists can be kept from running away with our society, if they are continuously bugged by entrepreneurs trotting along beside them and grabbing off bits in order to develop them for social use, albeit for the entrepreneur's self-interest. If the entrepreneurs in question are increasingly well educated, increasingly skilled, and increasingly aware of the implications of their role, perhaps their self-interest will be more consonant with society's.

But there is a second bridge that needs quick and intelligent building—a bridge between social science and society. That bridge is not building as well as the technological bridge. And many social scientists are increasingly alarmed about it. There is much talk these days in social science about social responsibility, public policy, paths toward peace, population control. Part of it comes from the social values of social scientists; part of it comes from the belief that the richest social scientific problems lie out there in the world. But I submit there is a dearth of entrepreneurial skill at moving our social scientific knowledge outward so that it can contribute toward our societal problems. And one good reason may be that we in higher education have almost consciously evaded the issue of training social scientific entrepreneurs and we have discouraged faculty entrepreneurship. We have come closest to it in professional schools—social work, education, business. But we have abhorred the idea of psychology and sociology departments.

I do not think that it is presumptuous to suggest that a cadre of highly charged entrepreneurial types, modeled somewhat after the tradition of the robber barons, but steeped in an understanding of social science and burning with a need to build, might do as much to bridge that gap, to solve those social problems, as any other force that one can imagine. We are seeing some small movement in that direction already. We are seeing large companies, where some vestiges of entrepreneurial activity are still sometimes to be found, taking on contracts for the Peace Corps, or for work with the governments of underdeveloped nations. We begin to see serious efforts to treat at least one part of the world population problem as a problem in marketing, using essentially the model developed in the marketing of household detergents. Can you picture the contraceptive commercials on the soap operas of Indian television?

And couldn't some more well trained social scientific entrepreneurs add more headway to the solution of race relations problems? Innovating new institutional forms, bringing new combinations of economic and social power to bear on the problem?

Any of us could probably go on to cite large segments of the world that could profit from more effective bridge-building between knowledge and practice. But the general argument is more appropriate. In a world in which new knowledge is proliferating, knowledge-converters may be almost as important as knowledge-makers. Our colleges and universities have been chiefly concerned with developing knowledge-makers. More of our energy at this point in history ought to go into developing knowledge-converters, precisely because our warehouses are rapidly overflowing with unconverted knowledge while our societies are crying for help.

My second point is that we ought to be developing a new breed of entrepreneurial good guys. We may in fact have been smothering the development of good entrepreneurs and leaving the world to the bad ones. Certainly those of us in higher education have shown no great love for entrepreneurial students. They are the wild ones who make trouble. They are either soliciting magazine subscriptions or circulating anti-administration petitions. Most of us probably perceive it as our duty to dissipate those foolish notions and strive to change Sammy from promoter to scholar. The promoter has never been a hero of any course I have ever seen, even in those educational institutions founded by promoters.

Moreover, if a central characteristic of the entrepreneurial personality is high achievement motivation, Professor McClelland's evidence suggests that our society hit its peak in the early 1900's and that the achievement theme has been pretty much on the downgrade ever since.

Even our business schools, where one would expect entrepreneurial behavior to have been staunchly supported, have done no job at all in that realm. Perhaps it is because we in business schools have been looking too anxiously over our shoulders at our colleagues in social sciences and liberal arts. We must put up an intellectual, almost anti-entrepreneurial face if we are to gain their acceptance. Or perhaps we in business schools have been preoccupied with large, complex organizations, and therefore with the development of organizational rather than entrepreneurial men.

In fact, if we in business schools have had any directional thrusts at all in the last decade, they have been in two directions somewhat antithetical to the whole entrepreneurial notion—and not for emotional, but for intellectual reasons. For our two major recent developmental directions have been first towards the behavioral sciences and second toward quantitative analytic methodology.

The behavioral emphasis has led us to study the human problems of organizations and normatively to encourage students to be open, cooperative, participative, and trusting. Correspondingly, in our research, our consulting, and our publications to the managerial world, we have emphasized the importance and value of participative, cooperative, highly humanistic organizational forms, and of corresponding people.

There is nothing necessarily antithetical between cooperative, trusting, group-oriented behavior and entrepreneurship, but the two are probably at least orthogonal. And in our emphasis on the first we have tended to neglect the second. One could even make the case that the old Mark I entrepreneur had to take an essentially competitive position, rather than a cooperative one. I am not sure that is the case, but if it is, there may be a fundamental kind of conflict between the orientation of the old style manipulative entrepreneur and the orientation of the modern participative organization man. But, as I shall try to show in a moment, we may be able to build a new entrepreneur more consonant with the participative model.

The analytic-mathematical thrust in business education has also been at least orthogonal, and perhaps antithetical, to the development of entrepreneurial attitudes. The analytic thrust encourages thoughtful, rational, scientific behavior. It emphasizes thorough understanding and evaluation of a great many alternatives. It is anti-impulsive in its orientation. And the values it stresses are the values of truth and understanding much more than the values of action and development.

Thirdly, business education has been oriented more and more toward the large, complex organization. We have been educating people for roles in those organizations, in part because those organizations are our best customers, in part because they present exciting problems to the academic researcher, and in part because that is where our analytic and social scientific tools can be put to work. The little businessman does not have a computer under his counter.

What we have done in business schools may be something of a mirror of what has gone on in undergraduate education. Certainly engineering has gone scientific rather than entrepreneurial. Today's engineer probably knows less about building a bridge and more about physics than his predecessors did. And today's psychology major may be much more scientific, perhaps philosophical in his orientation, and less vocational than yesterday's.

I must beg you not to misunderstand my position. I am not pleading for retrogression in education. I am not recommending that we pull math, statistics, and behavioral science out of the business school, to be replaced by the good old-fashioned case method. On the contrary, the future of business management and the administration of any large organization—hospital, government, prison—will become increasingly dependent on both behavioral and analytic knowledge and skills. What I am concerned about is that, in our emphasis on developing these educational thrusts, we have by indirection weakened the entrepreneurial thrust. It is time for us to start building a new kind of entrepreneur who is indeed skilled as a human being and intellectually skilled in his capacity to use contemporary tools of analysis, but who also wants most of all to change the world.

That image is a bit frightening, too. It is bad enough to have the shady old type of entrepreneur around, but at least he is ignorant and badly educated, so perhaps he can't do too much harm. But if we now deliver unto him all that we have learned in the social and quantitative sciences, won't he be a far more dangerous monster? I am not sure. He may indeed eat us.

Perhaps we must look more deeply into the nature of entrepreneurs. It's fair, I think, from somewhat indirect social scientific evidence to distinguish two classes of entrepreneurs. There is a power-oriented Type 1. He is the guy we fear; for given power, he will probably use it only to further his own self-interest. But can we also find a Type 2 entrepreneur whose primary orientation is toward achievement, toward building things? Perhaps even complete with strong, applica[illegible] needs? It is not so much personal power that he searches for as the satisfaction of accomplishment. We need not fear Type 2 although we may dislike him.

There is also some evidence, incidentally, that the Type 2 character succeeds in business more than Type 1. Executives whose self-images are of personal glory and reward apparently turn out to be less successful, other things being equal, than executives whose orientation is toward the accomplishment of tasks.

And yet while we in education have been ignoring or actually suppressing entrepreneurial propensities, complex social organizations have been changing in directions in which entrepreneurs could thrive, and prosper, and contribute. For if we look into changes in large industrial organizations, for example, we see at least two relevant phenomena. First, the organization has become so complex that it must be thought of as a society in its own right, not just a producer of *X* goods or services. Second, our emphasis on participative management, coupled with the recognition of the need for flexibility, has opened up organizational relationships, eased communication, and generally reduced constraints on individuals, at least at managerial levels.

All of which is to say that individual managers and groups of managers, even new and young ones, can now be more influential than before in shaping the organization and the direction it takes. Organizations are less rigid. Authority is much less the primary mechanism of control; knowledge and skill are far more relevant. Communication is much easier. We ought therefore to be terribly concerned about making the young managers conscious of their potential role as agents of organizational and social change. But for heaven's sake, let us not leave them as I think they now perceive themselves to be: passive, somewhat half-hearted pawns offering themselves to do whatever a largely imaginary old authoritarian structure bids, with goals of acceptance and adjustment rather than action and change. For even if they believe themselves or wish themselves pawns, they are not. They are agents of change, by dint of their special skills and knowledge, and by dint of the organization's increasing dependency on them as bearers of that skill and knowledge. And to change the world without awareness that one is doing so is irresponsibility in the extreme.

Moreover, if we look not inside the organization, but at the interface between the organization and the world, another phenomenon is visible. Large progressive companies are becoming much more than producers of products. One thing we increasingly mean by calling a business enterprise "progressive" is that it is actively reaching out into many sectors of the world. Top managers are worrying more and more about innovating, diversifying—seeking new fodder for their complex, self-perpetuating, flexible, organizational organisms. It almost doesn't matter what the organization did or made yesterday. The organization is quasi-autonomous. It has built-in resources. It is mobile. It is equipped with high-powered and flexible technology and multiple-skilled people. It can readily move from making shoes in East Oshkosh to developing agriculture in Timbuktu.

This is to say that modern, complex business organizations are themselves becoming perforce entrepreneurial social organisms. They embody such masses of skills and equipment and capital that they cannot continue to prosper on the same old food all the time; in fact, they may starve unless they reach out into new terrain and develop new resources. I was much impressed not long ago with a chart shown in the Sunday *New York Times*. It rank-ordered gross annual receipts of major governments of the world. If my memory is correct, the fifth-ranking body after the United States, the USSR, and two others was General Motors.

Perhaps one function of educators should be to joust with these dragons, though I doubt that. Another function may be to educate people who will lead them well. Another is to adjust the educational establishment toward civilizing them. It is clear that higher education for management and administration can no longer be concerned solely with the inner workings of the organization, and with the immediate interface between the organization and the market or the supplier. As complex organizations become more and more great, goal-seeking organisms, the people who direct them must be knowledgeable over a much wider range of affairs. For we now have supranational companies that are not truly citizens of any single nation. Satellites are operated by private firms. Greece has contracted with a private firm for the development of the Peloponnesus. General Electric is selling, to all takers, its engineering *knowledge*, as a product. Industrial organizations are clearly having a greater and greater influence on the development of the arts, on housing and public welfare, on medical service, on underdeveloped nations. So we had better educate smart leaders, leaders with high standards, intellectually and morally, and I submit we had better also train entrepreneurial leaders who do not deny their roles, but who perceive the power of their organizations and try to use that power to bring about relevant and hopefully useful change.

It is worth pointing out further that complex organizations are no longer run by individuals, but by groups. Despite the protests of company presidents about committee action and its weaknesses, the fact seems to be that more and more companies are essentially operated by executive committees or other formal or informal groups. I am quite sure that trend will continue, and with reason. One big reason is that groups are good devices for dealing with problems that are new and ill-defined. And that is what top management problems are like.

In some respects, the fact that organizations are increasingly run by groups makes me feel a little better, because some recent research has suggested that groups, under certain circumstances, are ready to take more risks than individuals. In a sense, groups are more naturally entrepreneurial. They are a little less inhibited, perhaps because the responsibility for their acts is distributed over all the members of the group. Hence they can be irresponsible with less guilt.

But we already know that groups can be trained together as groups, and that individuals can be trained to participate more effectively in groups. Those of us, particularly, in professional schools need to be more concerned about educating our students to work well in groups on action problems—and educating ourselves as well. If we bog down in interpersonal warfare and mutual deception, our capacity to be entrepreneurial creatively will surely suffer.

I suspect by now that many have abandoned hope for this paper; entrepreneurial leadership is not the kind of leadership educators wish to worry about. The kind of leadership they are most concerned with is leadership toward morality and responsibility, both of which seem to be on the wane. But let me argue that the world is changed by actions and techniques much more than it is changed by ideas. It is only when ideas are converted to actions, usually by action-oriented human beings, that things begin to happen. Wars will not end when everyone in the world wants them to end, because I suspect that almost everyone in the world wants them to end right now. They will end when some people have developed some actionable and implementable techniques for resolving conflicts by means other than war. So let us not denigrate the conversion of ideas to applicable technology. We have done too much of that already, and have thereby left too much of the action to Hollywood and Madison Avenue.

We come now to the toughest question. How should we go about educating "good" entrepreneurs?

One first step looks easy. It is relatively easy to identify entrepreneurial individuals. We have some testing procedures that will help. And in our own experience in business schools, my colleagues and I have been able to agree quickly on which students have an entrepreneurial flare and which ones don't. Typically, incidentally, the ones with an entrepreneurial flare are less likeable. They are apt to be diamonds in the rough, or at least rough. They are often impatient with intellectualism and the slowness and impracticality of the educational process. They are likely to be revolutionaries and activists within the school, trying to bring about change in the curriculum, faculty, or anything else they can get their hands on. And unfortunately, they are also often self-oriented; the world is a place from which they should take as much as they possibly can. I believe it would be relatively easy to develop further testing and other techniques for identifying students with a propensity for taking risks, for moving from ideas to action. We can also, if we work at it, distinguish between entrepreneur, subtype 1, who is power- as well as achievement-oriented, and subtype 2, who is less concerned with personal power and more with affiliation.

But let's not stop there. If education accepts the development and polishing of entrepreneurial interest as a serious function, by providing appropriate stimulation and models, and by designing appropriate curricula, it may help the entrepreneurial novice who arrived hungry for personal power to depart excited by the possibility of performing positive services for the world.

I am not at all sure just how we ought to go about trying to train such people, and I am not about to outline an entrepreneurial curriculum here. But there are a few obvious suggestions. First, there should be some redesign of our ideas about course content, especially in applied courses. Perhaps we should expect students to carry activities in courses from their conception through their implementation. Perhaps when we fund for education in these realms, one of the things we should be trying to get from foundations is risk capital, which our students are then permitted to risk, hopefully with some risk to themselves too, on entrepreneurial activities that they, or they and their faculties jointly, think up. Perhaps, and this seems to be happening anyway, the university itself should be a subject for change effort by students.

Perhaps, much more modestly, we simply need to have a faculty around that provides a model of Mark II type entrepreneurial activity. In recent years business school faculties have dichotomized somewhat into the business practitioners and the esoteric researcher types. The business practice members are by tradition more entrepreneurial. They are concerned with businesses and how they run. The researchy ones have been more like researchers everywhere, concerned with understanding and depth, and not much worried about practice. The researchers have been on the climb lately, so that most first-class business schools now have a far heavier research emphasis than they had ten years ago. But again, we may have ignored something. Perhaps this dichotomization should have been a trichotomization. For it is not at all clear that the development of the research flavor has been accompanied by an equivalent emphasis on the development of implementational research.

We have moved a little in that direction. Kurt Lewin coined the phrase "action research." He was concerned with blending research directly into social problems, trying to understand those problems by acting upon them. A very similar view has come out of some management scientists and operations research people, who have argued that we must work from real problems backwards. We will develop new insights, new tools, new understandings, if we research from problems as they are rather than from the academic discipline as it is.

But despite these orientations toward action and entrepreneurship, the over-all thrust of research in business schools and the social sciences has been away from action, risk-taking, and change; and toward an understanding of the basic nature of things. I am not against the second. I am just also for the first. Professors should be able to earn Brownie points in both ways and in other ways too.

So, by supporting research into the processes of action, by further developing techniques for identifying potential entrepreneurs, and by teaching people to work together in action-oriented groups, perhaps we can move toward entrepreneur Mark II. In some ways I am asking for something much bigger than that. I am asking that many of us in the educational world change our own values; that we look with more favor and less hostility upon our colleagues who are primarily interested in changing the world. Our world will change rapidly enough anyway. We had better educate our agents of change, to guide the changes as sensibly as they can be guided. And we had better put our educational institutions right where the action is.

Finally, I ask those who administer colleges and universities to start reconsidering the reward structure for academicians. Classically, we have divided the rewards between research and teaching, with some of us in favor of the latter and some strongly supportive of the former.

We have also usually included under the catch-all rubric "other activities" a growing bunch of things that are neither research nor teaching. They are activities for which people typically get paid separately, or which they do because they are usually considered peripheral to the academic role. In business schools we generally allow faculty members to consult one day a week. The rationale is that they need the money and also that business school people probably ought to keep a finger in the ongoing business process. But consultancy has become more than a trivial academic function. It is a larger mechanism for bringing about social change. A consultant, especially a university consultant, need not serve as a slavey to the powers that be. On the contrary, he is often a persuader, an influencer, an innovator in otherwise entrenched and rigid industrial, government, and social organizations.

It is true that colleges need to control the consultancy of their faculties. The consultant, if he spends too much time consulting, may get too rich or skip too many classes. But surely we can think up more ingenious and positive ways of exploiting this new role. Maybe, for example, graduate students should be involved in consultancy, along with their research and teaching practice. Maybe our administrators need to become more concerned with the kinds of consultancy the faculty member undertakes than with the time he spends at it.

Indeed, maybe some of our schools need to become active entrepreneurial consultants in their own right. Public health schools ought to work on population control. Business schools ought to work toward ethical marketing, the industrial development of underdeveloped countries, and so on. But let's get self-conscious about these processes. Although it is popular and simple to say that universities are centers of teaching and research, and although we may debate at length about the appropriate proportions of each, this third force has long since entered the scene—this social change force, this consulting business. Perhaps we can even formalize our understanding of this process. And perhaps thereby we can contribute to the development of much-needed entrepreneur Mark II.

Effective models of university governance

PART
III
CHAPTER
3

ALGO D. HENDERSON

FROM AMONG THE MANY possible models of university governance, I shall discuss three. Two of them involve the extremes of power concentration and dispersion, respectively, and the third, systematized group participation.

1. *Governance as a Vertical Hierarchy of Power and Authority*

The assumption of this model is that decision-making is done primarily at the top, with delegations of authority and responsibility to subordinate line and staff personnel. The model is usually shown as a job pyramid chart.

In the legal sense, a university is a corporation with the power vested in the governing board. The president of the institution is the executive officer for the board. Below the president is a hierarchy of administrative officers. The board delegates authority to the president, and the president in turn delegates authority to various other officers, individuals, or bodies. The president and, above him, the governing board retain the over-all power to approve decisions that have been made.

This model is the fruit of much history representing the authoritarian approach which originated in the position of the king or the army commander or the boss in industry. The model is the predominant one used in business, although some complex business organizations have instituted modifications based upon research findings from the behavioral sciences and experience in dealing with large numbers of employees.

The model was greatly influenced but not substantially changed in concept by the introduction of scientific management. Scientific management is the study of operating processes in order to subdivide and control work, thus improving the efficiency of operations. This reform in management contributed greatly to American industry's progress during the past half century. The time and motion studies resulted in goals that were set by management and imposed upon the employees. The employee was also subject to rewards and penalties as determined by the administration. This strengthening of the authoritarian approach brought reactions that caused still further reform in management, as noted below.

Universities use this model, and there are many pressures today to extend its use, including the introduction of scientific management to gain greater efficiency. As a businessman would say, "The universities should be more businesslike in their administration." Legislatures and coordinating boards are bringing similar pressures on the institutions to use, in some cases misuse, operating norms as bases for justifying educational programs and requests for funds.

Another and more subtle pressure to use an authoritarian model arises because of public agitation to secure conformance to social mores. Conformance is to be secured through disciplinary measures. Still others subscribe to this model because it represents the legal structure.

2. *Governance as Mediation Among Subgroups*

The assumption of this model is that a university comprises subgroups—trustees, administration, faculty, and students; colleges, departments, and institutes. These subgroups are said to have interests that differ from one another, and each needs to achieve power in order to protect and advance these interests. A *modus vivendi* is obtained through negotiation and agreement, especially between the governing board and the administration, on the one hand, and the faculty subgroups or as a whole, or the students, on the other.

In the business field, the recognition accorded to trade unions arose in part from rebellions against scientific management. Workers found their increasingly specialized jobs to be narrow and uninteresting and the imposed demands for productivity too arduous. The unions began to thrive as means of using power to bargain about goals and working conditions. The strike became an effective weapon in using power.

Certain research demonstrates that the best productivity is realized when subgroups are motivated toward high productivity. This implies some agreement about goals and working conditions. Thus it is contended that it is in the interest of the administration to negotiate with the subgroups in order to get a viable operation.

Realistically, administration in a complex university requires much mediation between individuals and among groups to reduce tensions and conflicts and to obtain optimum conditions for efficiency and effectiveness. That administrators must deal on this basis with subgroups, such as faculty bodies and student governments, is not a new phenomenon. Faculties, in particular, by tradition and custom have exercised much authority.

Some of the tactics of labor are relatively new to the college and university campus. This includes the use of vituperation and disruption as means of undermining morale and especially the respect of the organization for the top-level positions in administration; and it includes the strike as a weapon to gain concessions. The teachers' unions have succeeded in securing a considerable amount of support from faculty groups, especially in junior colleges and in urban institutions, in promoting their demands for increased wages and better working conditions. Student groups, especially those under the leadership of the New Left students and nonstudents, also use the strike as a means of being heard on controversial issues and of forcing negotiations relating to power.

Obviously there is much rivalry among subgroups for budget appropriations and for increases in monetary incentives. Clashes among groups also occur because of conflicting views relating to social action. Administrators, usually for good reasons, do not obtain sufficient funds to supply all felt needs, and they are highly protective of the institution in its public relations. Thus there is some basis for saying that the interests of the various groups differ and that disagreements about goals and working conditions should be resolved. The union concept may also be a means through which the faculty may negotiate with the governing board concerning such matters of academic interest as academic freedom and the selection and retention of a president.

Another pervasive factor is the presence of professional groups and civic organizations exterior to the university which receive the loyalties of professors and students. This causes the faculty members to become subgroup-minded, often placing their loyalty with the department rather than with the university as a whole, and the students to be influenced by activist groups to which they belong.

It seems probable that confrontation and negotiation as methods of achieving agreement among subgroups will increase rather than diminish, and hence administrators need to learn techniques with which to resolve these kinds of problems.

3. *Governance Through Group Participation in Decision-Making*

The assumption of this model is that a university is a goal-motivated organization, requiring reasonable unity as to goals and comprising professional men and women, and students, who voluntarily associate themselves because of commitment toward the over-all goals.

Colleges and universities have a strong tradition of collegial spirit and action. The faculty in many senses are peers of the administration. They are professional men and women, and each is expert in his own area of knowledge. If one looks at the classroom or the laboratory where the education and the research take place, it is clear that the professor must play a strong role in determining goals and methods. It can also be contended that since the student is the learner, he too will do a better job of learning if he helps map out the goals and the methods. Thus it can be reasoned that the professors and also the students should have a wider participation in determining the over-all goals, the program, and the evaluation procedures.

Traditionally and often legally through provision in the charter, faculty bodies are given much authority over the academic program and over the admission, progression, and graduation of students. In smaller institutions the faculties have carried this responsibility through "town meetings" and committees. The academic administrators usually are members of the faculty, and the president or dean presides. In any event, these officers have responsibilities of leadership within the faculty and the institution.

Student governments exist on most American campuses. In some instances they function on a paternalistic basis dealing with somewhat peripheral matters. The students call them Mickey Mouse governments. The difficulty arises because authority has not been sufficiently delegated to enable the student government to assume genuine responsibility. But they do participate.

Thus the group participative model of governance is in accord with some of the best traditions and expectations in American higher education.

The plan implies the formation of an organizational structure through which participation of individuals or of representatives from subgroups may assume genuine responsibility as a part of the decision-making process. People like to have the feeling that they belong, that they are essential and important members of a group, that their interests are understood, and that their opinions count. The morale of the total organization depends to a considerable extent upon the satisfaction of the members of the organization, and good morale is essential for securing the optimal results in education. The group participative theory thus seems to answer certain psychological and sociological needs of people.

Certain research relating to business and industry has demonstrated that genuine effectiveness in reaching goals occurs when there has been a reasonable degree of participation in establishing the goals. This promotes unity concerning goals, avoids misunderstandings, and avoids the resistances that occur when intercommunication has not been full and complete. Under the group participative plan, two-way communication is of the essence. Parallel to this is the finding that the best decisions are made at the locale where the best information lies. Thus it can be said that the good executive is one who fosters decision-making at lower levels and who works primarily at the policy level. This enables the executive to put emphasis on leadership as distinguished from management.

Another finding of research is that when roles within an organization are mutually supportive, the productivity is superior to that when the roles are competitive or hostile.

It should be noted that the group participative plan does not necessarily involve complete democracy, as it is often described. It is not a plan under which everyone votes on every decision. Instead, in implementing the plan, a method must be found for streamlining the participation in the decision-making.

The organizational structure can best be described through a chart which portrays overlapping circles, the individual circles composing the governing board, the president, the administrative staff, the faculty or faculty groups, and the student body. The circle implies group interaction and consensus. Likert suggests that the administrative structure can be woven together through interlinking pins. By this he means that each subgroup shall have a representative in the next higher functional group.

The pressures toward group participation arise because of faculty feelings about their responsibilities and their need to participate and from the students because of their desire to share in making decisions that affect them. Advocates of the model believe that the governing boards should be reconstructured, especially in personnel, to secure better representation of the cultural and vocational interests of the country and of the parties that are involved in education.

Of course, a principal reason for moving university governance in this direction is that the research in the behavioral sciences has been demonstrating the great importance of involving the personnel of an organization more fully in the decision-making.

Although the legal structure of colleges and universities implies the utilization of the authoritarian concept of governance, it seems clear that authoritarianism in practice does not harmonize well with the objectives of education or the nature of an educational institution. As an aspect of this, scientific management may suggest principles and procedures that may be applied to certain routinized activities, such as the janitorial work or even utilization of space; but it cannot apply effectively to research and learning. For the achievement of objectives in research and learning, efficiency in the use of funds or in the expenditure of time cannot be good measures because the product of the effort is too intangible. Education involves the use of tangible resources to produce intangible results. In education, effectiveness in reaching desired goals should be the criterion of success.

Although subgroups exist and will persist and may even become more aggressive as they learn further how to use confrontation tactics, these methods lessen the unity within the organization as a whole and place emphases upon working and living conditions as distinguished from educational goals. They also increase the dichotomy that so often exists between faculty or faculty and students, on the one hand, and the administration or the administration and the governing board, on the other. This approach to governance is inconsistent with gaining the group morale necessary for the achievement of the highest type of educational results. Subgroups, however, will continue to organize for the advancement of their own interests, and so ways must be found to resolve the differences and discover viable agreements. To reduce the impact of such conflicts, the subgroups need to be woven into the fabric of organization.

The group participative plan among the three models described takes the best account of the complexity of the individual and group interests. It is the best means of resolving problems that arise because of influences that come from the sociometric pattern, from the processes of informal communication, and through the utilization of various forms of power exercised by individuals or subgroups. The group participative plan is an orderly pattern for the involvement of people in relation to their ability to contribute, with all efforts being coordinated and with the final control appropriately vested in the administration and the governing board.

Autocracy versus democracy in top administration

PART III CHAPTER 4

JOHN W. McCONNELL

THIS TOPIC ATTEMPTS TO USE concepts normally applied to a political unity—city, state, or nation—to describe the government of an institution, but they do not fit the organization of a university or a corporation. These terms with their political meanings have little relevance to the kinds of problems which characterize the governance of a college.

Administration is a skill—a form of artistry which does not lend itself to scientific analysis. Administration can be studied, and certain techniques identified, but these become part of a complex and unique pattern of behavior in the actions of a single administrator. In a college or university the goal of administration is not a system of government but a quality of creative leadership which may call upon a variety of political devices to aid in the development of a dynamic intellectual community.

John Corson, in his recent address to the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, called attention to the unique characteristics of American universities which are turning these universities into the prime movers in our society. Briefly, these are the intellectual climate, the high concentration of talent, the tradition of objectivity, the professional requirement to search for new knowledge, and the nurture of our society's highest values. The job of top administration, in Mr. Corson's opinion, is to foster and conserve these attributes. Administrators cannot discharge this obligation in an autocracy, but neither is a democracy, in the political sense, likely to perform this function effectively.

Many writers in recent months—Harold Stokes in his University of Oregon lectures, for example—have pointed out that diversity is one of the prominent characteristics of higher education in America. The variety is endless. By purpose, organization, and history, institutions are different; and if one were to assume that there is a single pattern of administration to be applied to all of them, he would be most naïve, indeed. Furthermore, one institution over time may have many top administrators whose methods follow diverse, even contradictory, patterns, with equally beneficial results because circumstances require a new approach.

Physical growth alone makes administrative reorganization necessary, but the new functions assumed by colleges and universities also defy handling university affairs on a business-as-usual basis. A method of administration which seemed efficient when the university was a single institution is no longer practical now that the university is a system with several branches.

And it seems obvious that an administration of president and several chancellors does not lend itself to easy labeling as democracy or autocracy. Moreover, the growth of bureaucracy in large educational systems of higher education, aided and abetted by the use of computers, will call for a re-examination of older ideas of the qualifications of top educational administrators.

James Perkins of Cornell, in his Princeton lectures, said that presidents should take a more forceful hand in educational affairs. This advice has little relevance to a teachers college recently become a hustling liberal arts college, for the tradition of heavy-handed control by the president was almost universal among teachers colleges in the not too distant past. Conversely, Mr. Williams' suggestion that faculty must exercise more control would hardly apply to a Harvard or Cornell.

Now, having demolished the topic, I want to turn to a constructive process of describing some of the more controversial aspects of top university administration—those related to the leadership of people.

The functions of top administration are almost without limit; among them one would list (1) operating the institution within the financial resources available; (2) cultivating new sources of additional funds; (3) coordinating and giving direction to the institution's various activities—teaching, research, services; (4) setting the highest standards for recruitment and retention of personnel; (5) creating a favorable public image; (6) creating an atmosphere conducive to effective teaching, scholarly studies, and productive research; (7) organizing the business affairs of the institution so they are handled effectively with concern for the best interests and convenience of students, faculty, parents, suppliers, and town officials; and (8) defending the institution against attacks by those who would destroy its freedom or subvert its values. There are many others.

In my opinion, however, the central function of top administration today is that of creating a sense of community among the constituent elements who make up the college or university. I can suggest what I believe to be essential elements in the process.

It may be efficient logically to work out a neat organization chart in which all problems, proposals, and university business filter up from students, faculty, deans, and vice presidents. But as some perceptive businessman said, referring to his organization chart, it's what goes on in the white space between the boxes that really is important. The best organizational scheme does not of itself produce a sense of community, for quite often the more efficiently jobs and responsibilities are defined, the less the individual perceives the whole. It becomes the job of top administration to tie the diverse elements of the organization—students, faculty, nonprofessional staff, administration—into the institution in a vital and personal way.

If the concept of democracy can be applied to the institution at all, it is here, for direct participation in appropriate levels of decision-making is most effective in helping an individual identify with the institution. Somehow the formal procedures of student government and university senate no longer accomplish this purpose. New and more informal approaches through which top administration works closely and earnestly with groups and individuals are now needed. The top administration must be on campus. It is all very well for the president to use his position to foster a professional life outside the college or university. Some of this is important; professional stature is part of the president's strength, and some travel is essential in raising money and developing contacts required for university programs, but there is no substitute for the president who is visible and accessible. People engaged in every university activity like to feel that the top administration is interested. To reflect this interest in a concrete and personal way, administration must be present at campus events. I believe the influence of top administration is necessary to set standards of intellectual life and conduct, to secure adherence of faculty and students to values—and it is virtually impossible to exert such influence in absentia.

The enduring strength of great institutions lies in the loyalty and devotion of all their members. Today, the ties of faculty to their professional groups are great. Among some students, the institution and its administration are symbols of restraint and reaction to be challenged and defeated as opportunities arise. Unions which threaten the ideals of true community are becoming commonplace, particularly in large urban universities. It is vitally important that top administration find a way to direct the interest of staff and students toward common goals in keeping with the intellectual and cultural purposes of the institution. A beginning in this direction can be made by the attitude of top administration to faculty, staff, and students—there must be respect for individuals, faith in the objectivity and fairness of these groups, willingness to explain and persuade rather than to order. Students on policy-making committees demonstrate a maturity and personal concern for the institution which many trustees and administrators find astonishing. Faculty policy committees likewise are knowledgeable, sensible, and practical in finding solutions to troublesome problems. A critical examination of the outlook and practices of the top echelons of administration with regard to these attitudes and practices would be very informative.

Now let me be specific about two situations which increase the difficulty of building a community in a college or university and, consequently, pose serious questions of method for top administration.

Union organization among nonprofessional staff and faculty poses a threat to the prerogatives of top administration. I have consistently held that a labor organization of the traditional craft or industrial union type does not fit the purpose and general procedures of an educational institution. But for one reason or another, unions are beginning to appear on the campus, and now there is the question, "How does an administrator get along with a union?"

Whether the faculty members or nonacademic staff join a union is their business. Administrators may have firmly fixed opinions on the issue. Any attempt to prohibit or prevent the organization of a union on the campus, however, will increase the attractiveness of joining and provide further evidence of need. The most constructive approach is to accept the fact of the organization, and face squarely the gripes and grievances the leaders of the organization will bring to the table for discussion. These complaints may point to unknown defects in administration, in which case the only sensible thing to do is acknowledge the situation and clean it up as quickly as possible. Or there may be misconceptions about necessary conditions which need explanation. A patient reasoning approach will help to establish the reputation of the administrator as an honest, considerate man—and blunt the cutting edge of the drive for unionization.

While the above discussion attempts to give proper emphasis to direct contact between top administration, faculty, and nonacademic staff, there is real danger that deans and department heads will be shunted aside and fail to receive a consideration of top administration which they so richly deserve. These administrators are frequently the men in between. Pressed by demands of faculty on one hand, they are required to put into effect decisions from above which they did not make. It would be well for top administration to create procedures by which administration meets regularly and informally to transmit information in advance of public release and to exchange ideas about problems which these members of the official family see emerging.

Those who have their life work in educational institutions may be expected to be somewhat more rational and objective than others in their approach to difficult organizational problems. They are, however, human, and consequently they have the same psychological makeup as people who work in other establishments—private business, government agency, and service organizations. They need adequate economic return for their work, they need to be informed about what is going on around them, they need dependable relationships with subordinates and superiors that provide stability to normal life, and they need to feel that others respect them as individuals. If top administration is sensitive to these aspects of the people who make up the organization, challenges to the institution's position will be met with strength.

As the number of students and the variety of educational and research programs at an educational institution increases, the structure of top administration poses difficult problems. Decentralization of authority, separation of function, and delegation of responsibility are traditional ways of relieving top administration of the burden of direct supervision. As long as the allocation of authority is along school lines, administrative organization is simple and the top administrators (president, vice president, provost, deans) can retain a flow of information and close working relationships.

But the rapid growth of research and training which embrace many disciplines and two or more colleges, plus financial arrangements which require special accounting outside regular annual budgets, have created administrative substructures that promote new administrative structures. The multiplicity of centers, divisions, institutes, laboratories, branches, and programs defy neat packing. Moreover, the same faculty members find themselves aligned with several different administrative units as they participate in research, teaching, and special training programs. Consequently, top administration is constantly off balance because of the number of quasi-autonomous units and the competition among them for facilities and financial support. The problem is to tie these active operating units into the university scheme of things, to make them contribute directly to the main purpose of the institution, and to create for the individuals a sense of belonging to the institution.

Normally, one does not find that these quasi-autonomous units are represented in formal faculty government. Their professional staff are usually unaffiliated with regular schools or colleges unless they also teach, and often they do not hold formal faculty appointments. These members of the college or university community are really not part of the institution, and the units of which they are a part become centers of discontent and psychological conflict. The need to create a sense of community to which all belong, and in which all share as rightful members, is all too clear, and top administration is really the only agency which is in a position to effect this result. It is also apparent, however, that watering down the professional criteria by which staff for nonteaching centers are appointed as members of the faculty antagonizes some of the most competent faculty. This dilemma can only be solved by painstaking discussion with strong reference to democratic processes and ideals.

While neither autocracy nor democracy seems to be a suitable concept for examining university administration, the values and qualities which adhere to individuals, and the concepts of human rights which support democracy in the political sphere, are the unalterable facts which should guide the leadership of educational institutions.

The innovator and the Establishment

PART
III
CHAPTER
5

EDGAR DALE

THE PHRASING OF THE TOPIC suggests that the innovator is outside of the Establishment. We assume a system of forces, habits, cabals which are against educational progress, especially the way the innovator defines it. He hints darkly that the Establishment doesn't change, doesn't want to rock the boat. Sometimes the Establishment is defined as his colleagues, a department chairman, a dean, or the president himself. The Establishment is the power group that we are not in.

Further, the topic suggests a dichotomy: the good guys and the bad guys, the innovators and the status quoers. It suggests, too, that the innovator tends to be outside of the Establishment, an outsider looking in, a misunderstood missionary who is prevented in one way or another from spreading the one true religion.

I believe that clinging to the status quo, hewing to the traditional lines, following the old habits, is the normal thing to be expected, that big changes are neither sought nor worked for by most members of a college or university. In this we are not different from business or industry. The appearance of change is not change. Further, I suggest that more commonly change will come through the Establishment, not despite it.

There are many reasons why universities and colleges do not change. Some of them are the same as the reasons individuals do not change their politics, their mode of living, their patterns of travel, and the like. Novelty requires thinking, planning, is troublesome and uncomfortable. Innovation makes waves. Further, the alleged rewards of successful change must be matched against the predictable penalties of failure. The risk often seems not worth taking.

It is interesting to observe that striking changes have occurred in the high school curriculum. Distinguished scientists, linguists, social scientists, geologists from the universities have given of their time and energy to produce new high school curricula, of which the Physical Science Study Committee is an excellent example. This entirely new course of study includes such varied materials as special textbooks, workbooks, filmstrips, films, overhead transparencies, laboratory experiments, tactile materials, and evaluation materials. Another secondary program is being developed at Harvard and is titled "Harvard Project Physics." This program, too, includes widely varied materials.

I raise the question: Are the professors involved in these changes likely to lead a revolution in the curriculum and instructional methods in their own colleges and universities? Is it likely that the Carnegie Corporation will support James Conant in studying the curriculum of the college? Why don't the distinguished scientists study the teaching of their own discipline and make a report on needed changes? Why are these same college professors not pursuing vigorously changes in the curriculum and methods of teaching of their own subjects at the college and graduate level? Are we to assume that the present content and instructional processes are so satisfactory that nothing need be done? Is it a case of the innovator *vs.* the Establishment? I think not. I cite these reasons for lack of change:

1. The machinery of curriculum development in the college is weighted against change. As a member of our university committee on curriculum and instruction, I was impressed by the fact that we demanded evidence for the need of change but no evidence favoring the continuing of the status quo. We were worried about the proliferation of courses; we had over three thousand different courses, and we tried to keep the number down by rigorously and suspiciously viewing *all* new courses. We were not an agency of change and innovation. Further, we lost the battle of proliferation.

2. Professional rewards in a university usually come through publication and research. They do not come from committee work on innovations requiring long and continued curricular and instructional study. Committees are set up and disbanded quickly. Standing committees get enmeshed in routine, in housekeeping. Committee work is often an overload, not considered as a part of regular load. Innovation in the curriculum will require careful, long-term analyses of objectives, a study of terminal behavior.

3. We do not usually make rigorous taxonomic analyses of our objectives of instruction. The six levels of objectives presented by Benjamin Bloom and others are knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Knowledge, the simplest of these categories, is most commonly taught and tested for in college. This is training more than education, and requires memorizing rather than critical thinking. How often are college students asked to analyze a document to recognize unstated assumptions, distinguish facts from hypotheses, discover logical fallacies in arguments, develop novel or creative solutions to problems?

If you do not agree with my conclusion, I suggest that you carry on a simple study on your campus. Secure a sampling of questions on quizzes or final exams in a field of subject matter and classify the questions according to Bloom's taxonomy. For example, Christine McGuire (*Report to the Faculty 1965,* Office of Research in Medical Education, University of Illinois College of Medicine, p. 55) reports that 92 percent of the test questions given by the National Board of Examiners in Medicine were answerable chiefly by memorization.

Further, the high-flown general objectives that may be stated in the college catalogue may not be carried out in actual practice. Sidney Hook says that there is a tendency "to rest content with the formulation of goals, to overlook the difficulties of evaluating to what extent we make good what our college catalogues promise." ("Perennial and Temporal Goals in Education," *Journal of Higher Education,* January 1952, p. 12.)

Dressel and Mayhew point out in *General Education: Explorations in Evaluation* (p. 153) that "it became apparent that in spite of expressions to the contrary, representative teaching and evaluation in the humanities were restricted to knowledge of fact with some incidental attention paid to intellectual manipulation of that content."

4. Fundamental innovations in the curriculum will necessitate a corollary change in methods of evaluation. It is relatively simple to test the outcomes of the memorizing of information; it is difficult to test critical thinking, critical reading, listening and observing, the application of principles to new situations. As we move the college and university curriculum toward increased use of independent study, to more self-instructional activity, new types of tests are needed. Further, creative and inventive test-makers are in short supply, and many professors are either unaware of the inadequacy of their examinations or unable to do anything about it if they are. The widespread cheating on examinations occurs when the goal is primarily that of memorizing—the lowest category of the Bloom taxonomy.

Valid and reliable tests of new goals in instruction can have an innovative effect. They can show weaknesses in our claims regarding the reaching of stated objectives in the higher mental processes, and they can at the same time provide guidelines for new curricular and instructional procedures.

5. The typical professor is an entertainer of ideas, but not an applier. He is long on comment and short on action. The application of his ideas is considered a mere detail, something for a handyman or technician to put into effect, a service function. Actually, good ideas in many fields are not in short supply, but the engineering of applications is. We need the critical thinking required to set priorities and to develop applications.

I have indicated some reasons why innovations will be hard to make. However, the situation is changing. Increased funds are available. But what will be the source of the leadership?

Some innovations can be made which do not raise sticky problems of autonomy. On our campus, for example, we have in operation a half-million dollar dial access system which enables students to dial recorded tape programs in music, foreign languages, and lectures in varied fields. So far the medium is that of voice and music, and we are exploring the possibilities of video. Here we really have an extension of a library, and no one objects to increasing the accessions in a library. In the fall quarter there were 535,401 calls. The system is obviously a valuable learning facility.

In 1962 the University of Michigan brought a pilot program into being—aimed at joining the academic world of classroom, laboratory, and library with the social world of the residence hall. I assume from the report *Memo to the Faculty* from the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, December 1966, that the plan has worked well. Here was a pressing need of a rapidly growing university, coupled with an active working committee plus the thoughtful analysis of a psychologist-sociologist, Theodore Newcomb. One can only conjecture the huge number of man-hours required to develop and study this program.

If we want continuing innovation, we must build an adequate program of research and development into the structure of the university or the college. Many useful innovations do not disturb current arrangements, threaten no jobs or autonomies. A chemistry department, for example, can make a significant innovation in curriculum and instruction. But barriers are erected when we make an over-all attack on the curriculum of the college or the junior college—one which involves long and careful study by many departments.

Ralph Tyler said, in his commencement address at Antioch College in June 1963, "We now know enough about the conditions which contribute to learning to double the productivity of the college years." But "knowing about" is only a prelude to needed innovation. To make the necessary changes would require a massive effort, skillful management, administrative sagacity, talented specialists and generalists. Obviously, we are going to make studies of productivity—of ways in which learning can be sharply improved—of ways to make use of new media of instruction, of innovations in curriculum. Given our present rate of change in colleges and universities, any massive, over-all, generative change will come later rather than sooner. We look forward to the day when we have a vice president in charge of revolution.

PART
III
CHAPTER
6

Growing new leaders

CONRAD HILBERRY

A CARTOON IN THE *New Yorker* shows a reporter interviewing a university president: "As president of a great university, sir, what would you say is the most significant change you have observed in the last twenty years?" And all around them in the president's office are shaggy students holding signs, sitting on the floor or on the desk, leaning on the back of the president's chair, looking comfortable, impassive, as though they intended to stay right where they are. If we are to talk about leadership and how to develop it, it may be appropriate to begin by asking the reporter's question—what is happening in our colleges and universities?

I would like to note two changes that are already requiring different fashions of leadership from those we have been used to. The first change is the one dramatized by the *New Yorker* cartoon—the president's office jammed with students demanding free discussion, no censorship, student participation in administration. A few weeks ago I encountered a less dramatic variation on this same change. I was working with the very able president of a Catholic women's college in the east. The president, a Sister of Charity, reported that her college had been visited last spring by the regional accrediting agency—a routine review visit. One comment the visitors made was that communication between the administration and the faculty could be improved, some faculty members thought. This puzzled the president. She thought of all the devices they had developed to be sure everyone knew what was going on within the college—a faculty newsletter, announcements at faculty meetings, and so forth—and she wondered what was not being communicated and to whom. It was some six months later before it became clear to her. It wasn't communication that was wanted at all—or not communication in her sense of the word. The faculty wanted to help run the place. In her private opinion, the faculty were more fortunate than they knew, not having to worry through the underbrush of administrative decisions. But if this was the communication the faculty hankered for, she would do what she could to accommodate their wishes.

The point is this: though there may be benevolent (or even malevolent) tyrants in charge of some American colleges and universities, they are rapidly becoming rarities, curiosities. Students and faculty members are coming to assume that they will be consulted on decisions of any magnitude and that their representatives will review even the routine operation of the institution.

To introduce the second change, may I recite some facts:

Last year the twelve colleges of the Great Lakes Colleges Association had 104 faculty members on leave—enough to staff a medium-sized college.

For the average college graduate, five and one-half years elapse between the time he enters and the time he graduates. He works, he travels or lives for a time in another part of the country, he switches colleges, he joins the army, he goes away and comes back.

In 1955-56, Antioch College had twenty special funds—contracts for scientific, scholarly, or educational research, or for special service projects—totaling $175,622, or 6 percent of the gross budget. In 1965-66, the College had fifty-eight contracts adding up to $837,695, 14 percent of the budget.

The Associated Colleges of the Midwest has in the few years of its life established programs that send students and faculty to the Argonne National Laboratories, to the Chicago school system, to Cuttington College in Liberia, to the Newberry Library in Chicago, to Central America, and to a wilderness field station on the Canadian border in Minnesota.

Universities all over the country are creating residential subcolleges, semi-autonomous collections of students and faculty that promise intimacy and a distinct atmosphere inside the anonymous university.

These facts—and plenty of others like them—may be symptoms of a basic change in the structure of American higher education. Liberal arts colleges no longer sit like walled towns hoarding their provisions, and universities are not satisfied to be enormous shopping centers surrounded by hotels. What seems to be emerging is an elaborate network connecting institutions of many kinds and sizes. Within this network, students and faculty will have an academic home—a college, independent or associated with a university, where they are well known and where their work is evaluated. But they will also move readily to other places where they can earn money or try out a different style of life from the one they have been used to, or where their services are especially needed. As faculty members and administrators meet their friends in Washington, Chicago, or Los Angeles, as students run into each other in the Village, Beirut, or Addis Ababa, we become aware that the network already exists. But its implications haven't fully registered with us yet.

Suppose we agree that these two trends exist: increasing consultation with faculty and students in reaching campus decisions, and increasing interdependence of campuses on each other and on foundations, employers, private research institutes, foreign study centers, the government, all sorts of people and places off campus. What do they imply for leadership in higher education?

First, there has to be a lot more of it. Anyone who has sent students to Sierra Leone or to the National Institutes of Health or even to the college or university in the next county knows what an appalling amount of planning and managing and leading it takes. Anyone who has tried to tease from students and faculty members a stable consensus on any genuinely difficult issue of academy policy must have longed, sometimes, for the simple, blissfully dictatorial style of the college's founder. The college holds an NDEA institute or runs a Peace Corps training center: someone must conceive it, plan it, and run it. A dozen colleges decide to band together for their own advancement; unless they hire someone with experience and imagination to make something of the consortium, they might as well save their solemn vows of cooperation. The time may not be far off when half the faculty will be professional proposal writers—professional in the sense that their livelihood depends on it. Some universities may be close to that mark already.

Second, these trends appear to call not only for more leadership but for more varied leadership. The person who can concoct and carry out an experimental music and literature program in the local junior high schools may have quite different skills, quite a different sort of leadership from the person who establishes a cooperative graduate program in urban studies. And neither one of them need be anything like the dean. Or the president.

Where are these leaders to come from—so many and so varied? One might answer that they will appear; the jobs will need to be done and someone will learn to do them. Right now we are doing many more of them than we did five years ago. Or one might answer that we will never do them; society is multiplying its complexities so fast that we can never hope to have the leaders—or managers, administrators—we need. Both of these answers are probably true, but neither is very helpful. The real question is whether we can think of any way to grow better leaders sooner.

I can think of several things we might try, but I am not convinced that any of them will be adequate to the problem.

First, I wonder whether we might rewrite our job descriptions so that key administrative assignments—deanships and presidencies—are more humane and more attractive. My impression is that colleges and universities have been treating their faculties better and better. Salaries are not bad and consulting jobs sometimes augment them; faculty are almost always encouraged to experiment with teaching arrangements and to conduct their classes in whatever way works best for them; money is often available to help them carry out the research or creative work they want to do; many can study or teach abroad; there are plenty of opportunities for short-term or part-time administrative work—in short, faculty have remarkable freedom to use their time and energy in ways that seem most rewarding or most congenial to them. But it appears to me that deans and presidents have less control over their own time and activity than they formerly had.

Recruiting, money-raising, budget deliberations, meetings, speeches, proposal deadlines, schedule-making, curriculum planning, and internal squabbles leave administrators comparatively little freedom for work that they themselves initiate. If this is the case, can anything be done about it? Would the institution really founder if administrators had nine-month appointments? Or if they took sabbaticals? Or if administrative responsibility were shared more broadly than we have customarily thought to be efficient?

Second, might we train people for both formal and informal leadership more deliberately than we now do? (The American Council on Education internships are one attempt to accomplish this.) Many institutions can now predict that they will continue to need a regular supply of administrators each year. Would they not do well to have people preparing to do administrative work even before they know exactly what positions will need to be filled? For example, it seems to me likely that the Great Lakes Colleges Association will be needing perhaps half a dozen new people each year to manage its programs—not full-time administrators, but faculty who can continue to teach at their own colleges while they help to run one of the Association's programs. I wonder whether the GLCA might not set up a program designed to discover faculty members capable of this sort of leadership and to give them some preparation for it.

Of existing programs that attempt this, the most successful one I know of is the North Central Association's Leadership Training Project—now called the Associates Program, I believe. Its immediate aim is to prepare people to serve as accrediting examiners and consultants for the Association. But by asking them to look closely at some extraordinarily varied institutions, it often sends them back to their own campuses with new perspectives, new ideas, new ways of asking questions. Generalizing from the experience of this project, I would guess that an effective training program will have these three features, among others: (1) It will be planned so that a person can participate without giving up his regular work. Some of the people one most wants in such a program will be unable or unwilling to take leave of the work they are engaged in. (2) As part of the training, a person will do a genuine job, not a made-up one, of the sort he is being trained to do. (3) Those in the program will have plenty of chance to discuss and criticize the whole organization that they are preparing to lead.

Finally, I wonder whether we can become more conscious than we have been of the skills that make up academic leadership. Most faculty members, I believe, have a strong sense of *craft*. They take pride in their ability to read a poem they have never seen before and make something of it, to conceive and construct a piece of apparatus that will prove or disprove an hypothesis, to take a miscellaneous assortment of students and somehow catch them up in a discussion of economic theory or German literature. A faculty member feels he has skills that are not easily acquired and cannot be faked. I am convinced that effective administration, while less specialized than chemistry or theatre, requires skills no less complex and no less valuable. But we know relatively little about these skills (as we know little about the skills that make for effective teaching). Studies of campus governance, such as the one my colleague, Morris Keeton, is managing for the American Association for Higher Education, may give us a more precise and more vivid idea of the discipline of academic administration. However it comes, it will be a welcome day when we understand better the element of craft as well as the element of character in academic leadership, and find ways to cultivate both of them.

Planning as a continuing leadership process

PART III CHAPTER 7

RONALD LIPPITT

THE TOPIC IS IMAGE—that aspect of leadership that has to do with the notion of looking ahead, with a creating of images of potentialities for the future, and working in the here and now on the notion of creating for the future, in terms of directions we want or hope for, in our efforts to attain more goals.

What is there in this prospect of continuous alertness to the future and to making planning efforts and planning decisions about the future that suggests certain kinds of required leadership functions or processes?

One of the requirements and one of the tough tasks of this scope of leadership is that of resisting continuous and complete involvement in the pressing demands and challenges of the here and now. We have really no time and energy to be concerned about the future because of the great pressing demand of fires to be put out here and now. So, take initiative to resist this complete involvement; this is one of the leadership requirements.

A second type of initiative is that of doing preparatory work on problems that have not yet become pains, of making predictions about what the confrontations are going to be, and putting energy into them now before they become problems with pain and budget.

I have been involved for a couple of years with the panel working on the issue of the structure and function of the National Education Association. There one runs into the problem, for example, of how to get people involved in thinking about the different problems that will exist in having national services for 2 million rather than 1 million people; what it will be like when over 50 percent of the teachers in the country are not in the public schools, as will be true by 1980; what it will be like in curriculum planning in college to be dealing with students who have had entirely different elementary and secondary educations in many ways; what it will be like because the world of *X* decades ahead will have different occupational roles.

These are just samples of areas in which we do not have any great pain at the moment, but have great planning responsibilities if there is to be leadership of the planning sort.

There is, of course, another kind of leadership which might be thought of as risk-taking. One has to make predictions among alternative probable states of affairs in the future and commit planning efforts in terms of judgments about these alternatives.

These, as I see it, are some of the initiative issues that have to do with our relationship to the future. What are some of the concrete leadership tasks which this prospect of initiative implies?

First, clearly, is the problem of searching for and retrieving data about direction and rate of change from the environment. I was talking recently to the president of a very rapidly growing corporation. I asked him what his major job was in the research and development division. He said, "Monitoring the environment twenty years from now is our major job. We have to take risks if we are going to do a job of monitoring the job twenty years from now." He added, "We used to think a five-year plan was pretty good. We can do better predicting for ten years from now than we could five years ago. Our risk of predicting is better about ten years from now than it was five years ago about five years from then."

So we need to focus on where and how to research for retrieving data from our environment, to see the relevance of kinds of data we don't usually tend to think about as data that we need for our own progressions.

I was working recently with a national oil company on the problems of training gas station attendants, and we ended up in an hour-long discussion of what was going to be happening to pleasure time and the need for young people in the gas stations who were able to be expert guides to the recreation resources of the area if they were to attract the patronage of those people who are pleasure-bent. We went to a number of other images of the mobility potential of young men starting out with the role of gas station attendants, but with certain kinds of upward mobility related to various skills. This was completely real to these leaders of a national oil industry, that this was the direction in which thinking and training should be going in order to hold manpower. There is no question that recreational resources ten years from now are a real consideration in the training of gas station attendants. This was the way they thought about their planning.

I think of another example. There is clearly a move—which will continue, I think—toward a much greater spread of the educational functions of rearing and educating the young by communities rather than school systems. Coordination, therefore, at the community level of educational curriculum, ideas, and use of educational resources becomes a crucial planning function. But I have found only maybe five out of twenty-five superintendents who see such coordination as a significant thing to spend time and energy on.

Let's say we have been somewhat bolder than usual in retrieving data of various kinds to help us in monitoring the environment. There is still the great problem of retrieving the resources to help us interpret and make judgments about those data. What kind of manpower help do we need? What kind of functions or roles to help us make interpretations?

I think, for example, of when we recently were dealing with 130 inventions in the area of increasing public school children's motivations to learn. One of the questions was how to make a judgment about which of these types of innovations are part of the future and which ones should die now. We found that a panel made up of philosophers, scientists, educational psychiatrists, administrators, and teachers did a very exciting job of projecting rating dimensions for evaluating. As one of them said, "This is probably the best way to approach the idea of anti-faddism." Everyone thinks because something is new he ought to adopt it. Most of the innovations adopted ought to die, yet some of them are little pieces of the future right now. But how can we sort out the little pieces of the future right now that ought to be supported and developed from those things that do not have anything significant for the future? This is the challenge of using our knowledge resources and combining, too, knowledge resources to make the judgments about the use of our data that we have collected about the future.

John Gardner talks about one of leadership's initiatives being to lift people out of their petty preoccupations and carry them above conflicts. I would add something like helping collectivities like communities or school systems or colleges to achieve some collective self-awareness about themselves as objects to be looked at and understood as a totality, rather than in terms of subgroups that exist.

I think back to one of the greatest creative innovations that never survived: the Community Society Dramas, in which a committee of citizens delved into the history of the community and re-created our past, represented our present, and projected our future, putting on annual pageants to create an image of ourselves for ourselves.

I think some of these kinds of inventions are needed to create self-awareness of ourselves as a larger collective than the individual or the small group. Awareness of communities is going to be increasingly important as fragmentations more and more put us into subgroups within the community or campus.

The second aspect, it seems to me, of lifting people above their petty current preoccupations is looking at and pinpointing micro-demonstrations of the future in the here and now. In social practice, somewhat differently from medical and agricultural and technological practice, there is such a great lag between current knowledge resources and genuine utilization of that knowledge. One can find, if one scans pictures of the future existing in a micro-way in the here and now, demonstrations—sometimes in families, sometimes in classrooms, sometimes in school systems, and I think probably even in total colleges hidden around the culture—that are some way ahead and represent the ways of looking at the future now in a sort of demonstrated way as a help to planning, if there is adequate scanning to discover it.

Another point in this business of working on the future is that of legitimizing and supporting dialogue about goals and images of potentiality, rather than having it be, as is typical, a rather embarrassing topic of discussion. I find it is just as difficult for teachers to talk about as for teen-agers. There is such a resistance to talking about goals; or if there is goal talk, it is at a level without any sense of commitment to the consequences. I have been impressed, in our leadership laboratories for higher education at Bethel, with the frequency with which college leaders will say, "This is the first chance we have ever had to talk expressly about values." Well, this business of legitimizing goal talk and relating it to action talk is a crucial part of the leadership notion.

I was at one time teaching in a teacher's college in the South where a very progressive lab school was attached to the college. Teachers were fifteen or twenty years ahead in terms of their training and the images of good practice they were given. They went, then, to teach in one-room rural schools. You can imagine the combinations of frustration, of righteous indignation, of withdrawal. You can imagine all the different problems of creating a creative linkage between the here and now and the future in these young people.

Well, we instituted, as part of our teaching program, a course which we called "Creative Authoritism," and in it we worked on understanding the parents and the children and the past they had, leading up to the new teacher's stepping into that classroom, understanding the dynamics of why things would go to pieces, why there would be all kinds of images of inadequacy and inappropriateness, and the big thing the students had to work on.

Basically, I think our biggest problem is that of connecting planning, deciding, and doing as a continuous prospect.

The linkage of good plan to skilled action is, I think, the toughest challenge of leadership for continuous self-renewal of any kind. Creating new plans for new patterns of the future is much less of a risk than initiating changes of action. We have found that there is a great difference between accepting ideas, accepting images of the way things ought to be, and taking any kind of risk in action.

I think, on the whole, we have been taught that the thing that one can get real reward for is getting the ideas right, getting a good plan, rather than that the payoff is a creative linkage between a good idea and doing something about it.

This is quite a different problem for us, as educators, than it is for those moving into the future in medicine, agriculture, or technology. Most of the creations there are through things to be used—new machines, new drugs, new farming practices, new insecticides, new seeds. The new things for us in education are new patterns of human behavior; new patterns of interaction between administrators and faculty members, faculty members and students; and new patterns of performance as models of things to be developed, innovated, adapted in the future—patterns which confront our values, our attitudes, and, most of all, our skills.

One thing we become aware of when we think about the commitment to action rather than commitment to having the ideas right is that very often those who need to be involved for action happen to be different people than those who might constitute the core planning team. We are all familiar with the typical phenomenon of a small group planning and being indignant that the rest won't act; but maybe we ourselves are all walking case studies. And what are some of the reasons for the great lack of linkage between our intentions and actions? First of all, our repertoire of action skills is much less sophisticated than our repertoire of ideas and concepts. We lack differentiated action resources. Our behavior tends to be really primitive compared with our intentions. Also, our actions, whether collective or individual, are much more public and vulnerable than our plans. They represent a kind of full commitment.

Action is, in a way, us and our identity and more irreversible. Our planning can be changed much more easily than our committed acts. Action usually requires more involvement of others. It is easier to plan independently than it is to act independently.

The implications are that just as planning can be exploratory and developmental, so also must we find a variety of ways to have action tryouts that are exploratory and developmental.

With these concepts in mind, let us return to Secretary Gardner's points. First, different persons might be quite good leadership resources at different points in the planning, action, and feedback processes. Now, it is often difficult for us to accept the notion that one person is not best for all kinds of leadership. This notion of differentiating types of leadership resource, which Mr. Gardner emphasizes, is quite important.

Another point is the problem of collaborative coordination between leadership groups. We have found no understanding of other groups' goals. They use each other, not as referrals, but for buck-passing. Concern with the machinery of action and implementation becomes one of the challenges of leadership, rather than a source of ulcers and righteous indignation and a withdrawal from leadership roles. As Mr. Gardner points out there are many forces in society that help us avoid seeking leadership roles because of the kind of frustrations we find when we discover that leadership is an idea. Leadership does not focus, for example, on the dirty work of action.

Third, creating a linkage between the university and the community is a great challenge to creativity. Here is one of the problems of finding the process linkage between ideas and concepts on the one hand, and the action resources and skills on the other hand.

Lastly, we must look within ourselves to study and cope with the pathology of good intentions and plans and ideals that never become commitments and never are tried.

Acceptance of major curricular changes

MILLER UPTON

PART
III
CHAPTER
8

IT WOULD SEEM TO BE reckless to attempt to speak to the subject of how one goes about gaining acceptance of major curricular changes. There is danger in attempting to imply that there is a general technique that is equally applicable and successful in all situations.

The most I can do is try to identify the combination of factors that prevailed at Beloit to enable us to adopt a substantially revised curricular approach at a time when the College was probably stronger than it had ever been before in its history. From the analysis of this single case, it is hoped that certain principles can be identified from which others might be able to devise approaches particularly applicable to their own situation.

Our curricular change did not come about over a short period of time. It evolved out of events that spanned some thirteen to fifteen years. When a college is on the verge of oblivion there is no problem in its achieving instant curricular revision. All interested parties recognize that it is this or nothing. Dynamic, creative, dictatorial leadership is therefore welcomed by all. Time is of the essence in the abbreviated sense rather than the prolonged sense. The history of American higher education contains many evidences of the pressure of imminent failure's providing the condition for immediate radical curricular change.

When, however, panic is lacking, time is needed to develop a general climate that has the equivalent effect. It is idle to think that under normal conditions a president or a dean can bring about major curricular change through his powers of persuasion or by manipulative techniques. And yet the congeniality of the climate to such change is a vital responsibility of the president and the dean.

This is one reason why I find so very regrettable the relatively short tenure of college presidents in particular. A long tenure does not guarantee successful academic leadership, but the kind of environment necessary to curricular vitality cannot be created in a short period of time. The college that experiences rapid turnover of its top administrator is not likely to contribute much to higher education in the way of curricular innovation. A strong, stable faculty can preserve an existing strong situation, but it cannot promote creative change. Some individual faculty member needs to come to the fore to provide leadership in this direction, or more typically this becomes the basic function of the dean and president.

I use the terms *dean* and *president* in combination, for change is dependent upon both in harmony wanting to produce such. The faculty is, of course, key. If the faculty is not ready for major curricular change, then it naturally cannot come about in any enduring sense. The dean must enjoy both the confidence and respect of the faculty, and have the general administrative capacity to coordinate and direct efforts. If he is not effective along these lines there is not much the president can do to compensate. All he can do is replace him.

The president's role is twofold. As institutional head he is the person most responsible for the quality of the general climate. If he is not interested in curricular change it is not likely that he will be sensitive to the ways the general environment is conducive or not conducive to such. Also, he is the person most directly responsible for influencing other key segments of the college—the trustees, the administrative officers, and the alumni. Although the faculty is the body which must produce the change, these others are essential in the over-all institutional approval, acceptance, and implementation.

The president is in many ways the most important figure of all. If he is not vitally concerned with the use of the institution he heads as an instrument for improving higher education in general, if he is more of an operator than a leader and administrator—more concerned, that is, with running his institution than with contributing to educational advance—there is no hope for change of any fundamental sort. And regardless of the interests of the dean and the faculty, if the president is not strongly committed to the need for change, it is not likely to come about. On the other hand, given a president interested in curricular change of a fundamental sort, the other necessary conditions can be developed over time.

The most important of these conditions is a general interest on the part of the faculty and trustees in doing something. This interest can develop out of a dissatisfaction with the accomplishments of higher education in general, a dissatisfaction with the accomplishments of the college, or a combination of the two. I would imagine it would not be too difficult a job of leadership to get the faculty and trustees of any institution to reach the same sense of dissatisfaction. It must be admitted, however, that in this endeavor small size is an advantage.

The initial step at Beloit was taken in 1951 when, under one of the early self-study grants from the Fund for the Advancement of Education, a thorough study in depth was undertaken. The study was successful as an initial conditioning device because of the thoroughness of its approach and the extent to which it involved the key segments of the institution—faculty, trustees, and alumni. It had a massive impact because it was a massive undertaking in terms of coverage and involvement.

This is a prime requisite. If there is real interest in doing something major, there must be a total commitment to the inquiry and full involvement. A partial approach will never come off—partial in the sense of hesitancy to grapple with the real issues or restriction of the inquiry to a small group. There is, of course, some danger to undertaking something fully and then not having it succeed. But whereas full commitment and involvement do not assure success, they are necessary if there is to be hope for success. A hesitant or half-hearted approach will not have the general impact needed to condition the prevailing institutional climate adequately.

At the conclusion of our self-study the faculty was rather well divided on the recommendations proposed, and the trustees were not sufficiently concerned. This, I would say, is the normal state of affairs at such times. But by the same token, the whole institution had been permeated by the study, and a general sense of restlessness and impatience had been created. Fundamental change is never accomplished without some amount of rancor, friction, and dissension during the process of change. The critical concern is that a permanent schism not develop through the creation of too much heat in the process. Here, again, time and patience are essential.

Following the completion of the study various organizational devices were used to provide full involvement of the faculty in an ongoing consideration of the implication of the study. This seems to me a major consideration. The initial study must from the outset be considered initiating and not terminal. Too often such studies are completed and placed on the shelf to gather dust rather than used as merely the first stage of an ongoing process.

The faculty was broken up into divisions for discussion of broad philosophical issues as well as specific curricular requirements. A special faculty meeting was held each month to discuss the purpose of higher education, the purpose of a liberal arts college, the purpose of Beloit, etc. There were times when the whole community seemed about to explode from the frustrations produced by such ceaseless introspection. Without basic commitment to the need for fundamental change, the whole process would have been scrapped at many points along the way. The trustees were kept informed of developments through their regular meetings and through joint faculty-trustee committee meetings, and the alumni were kept informed of activities by way of their regular communicative media.

Although many interesting and worthwhile curricular revisions and additions were introduced, there was none which attacked and attempted to improve upon the existing form and structure of higher education. Finally, yet another committee was appointed by the dean at the urging of the faculty. Since this is the committee that developed the plan subsequently approved by the faculty and board of trustees, it is worth giving special attention to those conditions which seemed to contribute to its success.

To begin with, those of the faculty who had been the enthusiastic young Turks at the time of the 1951 self-study were now the respected, tenured old guard. The original old guard, who had opposed the early recommendations, had by now retired or died. As a consequence of the constant introspection and concern which followed the early study, we now were faced with the unusual situation of having most of the senior members of the faculty conditioned in favor of radical change. In a sense it can be claimed that our achievement was a victory for patience and endurance.

In 1951 the dean was new and the president on the verge of leaving. The new president did not come on the job until 1954. By 1962, when the committee was appointed, the administrative situation was stabilized and both officers knew who among the faculty could be counted on to contribute most to the committee work. Vitality in the direction and work of the committee was provided by appointing as chairman a new, but senior, member of the faculty who was very interested in the process of higher education.

The strategic technique employed by the committee was to avoid trying to formulate some generalized statement of educational purpose from which a supportive curriculum would be developed. This had proven to be a futile task in the past. Rather, every member was asked to make a list of ways in which our present curriculum failed to provide the kind of liberal education we considered essential. The committee then agreed on a number of these and proceeded to have each individual independently propose ways of overcoming these weaknesses.

Although we had found it practically impossible to get any general agreement on an elaborate abstract statement of educational purpose, we now discovered a high degree of agreement on educational weaknesses. Note, these were not institutional weaknesses, such as insufficient endowment, need for new buildings, etc., but rather weaknesses in educational performance. This experience seems to suggest that faculties do have common educational premises but are unable to articulate them in concise statements.

Throughout the year and a half of deliberations and development of preliminary proposals, care was taken to communicate progress to the critical publics. Open meetings with the faculty at large were held for the purpose of involving all parties in the discussion. It was deemed critically important that no item of major change be brought up for vote that would come as a surprise to anyone. The initial reaction to any proposal for major change is one of opposition until all implications can be explored. At the same time the trustees were kept informed and involved, as were key members of the student and alumni bodies.

The time and effort expended in this thorough communication effort paid off handsomely. At the annual alumni conference when the preliminary plan was presented for information only, an unsolicited motion was made from the floor that the program be endorsed, and some 125 class agents and secretaries voted unanimously in favor. The final vote of the faculty was sixty-eight for and three against, with seven abstaining. By the time the matter reached the executive committee of the board of trustees, it was approved unanimously and with enthusiasm. I had specified from the outset that since the proposals were so major from the standpoint of both institutional policy and financial considerations, the plan would have to be approved by the trustees as well as the faculty.

One other point needs to be mentioned. We made extensive use of outside consultants. This seems to be essential in all such processes to avoid an ingrown characteristic from developing, to add stimulus to the group's own initiative and enthusiasm, to check hypotheses with experts, and to have some objective means of evaluating the over-all efforts.

PART
III
CHAPTER
9

New degrees for college teachers

STEPHEN H. SPURR

THE TREE OF LEARNING HAS MANY BRANCHES. Each may be identified by the name of a degree. The need to define the zones of the tree of learning better has assumed urgency in recent years as academicians have come to realize that the traditional training program for the Ph.D. cannot possibly—and perhaps not even properly—fill the urgent need for college teachers in our overcrowded, complex institutions of higher learning. It is perhaps arrogant to speak of new degrees; rather, we should face the issue of what degrees, whether merely proposed sometime in the past or currently in use on a restricted scale, are relevant as comprehensive solutions to a widespread problem.

In speaking of new degrees for college teachers, therefore, we are not discussing a new terminology, but rather a new acceptance of existing proposals in the hope that a large number of graduate students will find a satisfactory objective both in terms of their academic pursuits and their subsequent careers. Such acceptance does not preclude the possibility of reexamining and tightening up the Ph.D. program itself. That is equally vital.

Proposals for intermediate degrees between the baccalaureate and the doctorate fall into two general categories: those designed to identify progress along the main trunk toward the Ph.D., and those designed to mark a terminus on a branch. The first record successful progress to a given node of those aspiring to the Ph.D.; the second, successful completion of a program by those who initially aspired to a lower but completely respectable goal. The concepts are compatible. Both have a place in the graduate school.

The concept of formal recognition of progress en route to the doctorate is exemplified by the Yale version of the Master of Philosophy degree, Fredson Bower's proposal of a Doctor of Liberal Arts degree, and the developments at Michigan, Northwestern, and Berkeley leading toward a candidate's degree or certificate. The principles are put succinctly in a statement recently prepared by the graduate deans of the CIC (Committtee on Institutional Cooperation: i.e., the Big Ten plus Chicago):

> A Candidate's Certificate, to be called Candidate in Philosophy, is proposed for the purpose of recognizing formally the successful attainment of that stage in the doctoral program marked by the passing of a comprehensive examination and the completion of essentially all requirements up to the doctoral dissertation. The certificate is intended to mark an intermediate point in the advance toward the doctorate at a level widely recognized in American graduate schools.

> This recognition would designate, not those who are unsuccessful, but rather all those who have successfully completed this stage and who are considered to be qualified to prepare a dissertation regardless of whether or not they may actually do so. It affirms accomplishment to date. It regulates neither the duration of time nor the conditions under which a dissertation may subsequently be prepared. Its award does not confer with it candidacy for an indeterminate period at the awarding graduate school. Neither does the certificate lapse, since it is a statement of prior achievement, not of status in a program.
>
> Since the term Candidate in Philosophy implies an intermediate status, it would be awarded only in those departments or fields authorized to confer the doctorate.
>
> The concept of such recognition of intermediate accomplishment en route to the doctorate in no way conflicts with the development of terminal intermediate degrees designed to meet the needs of other students who aspire to career goals for which the Ph.D. would not be the appropriate academic degree.

To some, this proposal may seem insignificant in that it sets forth no new program or experimental and provocative requirement. To this criticism we can only reply that the rubrics of the A.B., the A.M., and Ph.D. themselves are equally broad; and if we are to insert a new universal degree between the master's and the doctor's, it must be on such a generalized plane that widespread acceptance and adoption is possible.

A word on nomenclature. One may properly identify this point of progress with an existing title such as Master or Doctor by adding a different modifier. I argue, however, that the point is clearly higher than that identified by the general concept of the Master and definitely lower than that named by Doctor. It should be given its own unique name, one that will acquire acceptance and status with time in its own right. I venture to suggest that the title Candidate in Philosophy, which adds a new dimension to an established European degree, will be that term.

The complementary solution to the main trunk intermediate degree involves the establishment of a terminal degree requiring two to three years of full-time study following the baccalaureate. Students specifically apply and are accepted for a program distinct from the Ph.D., and there is no implication that they will be allowed to continue on toward a doctorate following successful completion of their program.

The terminal two- to three-year graduate program is characteristic of professional training today. Degree titles may carry the word Doctor, Master, or yet another identifying term. Thus we have Doctor of Dental Surgery, Doctor of Pharmacy, Master of Business Administration, and Master of Social Work. In those areas where a master's connotes approximately a year's work and where ultimate achievement is marked by the Ph.D., however, the tendency has been to seek terms signifying achievement higher than a master's but lower than a doctor's. Thus, we have widespread acceptance of the professional Engineer and the Specialist in Education.

What we do not have, as yet, is an acceptable nationwide degree signifying subject matter competence above the A.M. or M.S., but below the Ph.D. in the sciences, humanities, and arts. A terminal program leading to such a degree could well attract to careers as college teachers many graduate students who would not otherwise enroll in the main trunk program leading ultimately to the Ph.D.

Current efforts to establish such a terminal graduate program for the preparation of college teachers appear to be following two general lines: one involving a pure liberal arts approach, and the other adding a component of supervised college teaching and education course work.

The first variant is perhaps best characterized by the University of Toronto version of the English Master of Philosophy program. Here, the course of study involves two years of graduate work in a subject matter field and the preparation of a major essay or research paper representing independent scholarship, but not necessarily an original contribution to knowledge. At Toronto, the program is offered thus far in sixteen humanities and social science departments; but at Cambridge and at London it is also available in chemistry, electrical engineering, and some other sciences. Admission to the Phil.M. program is separate from that of the Ph.D., but an effort is made to ensure that accepted students are fully as strong in their earlier academic work as those accepted for the doctorate. All of the first eight candidates to receive the Phil.M. by the fall of 1966 at Toronto were employed by Canadian universities.

The second variant is under development at a number of American universities. At the University of Tennessee, for example, the degree Master of Arts in College Teaching has been established as a goal for a separately admitted group of students who will pursue a two-year program concentrating in a substantive field, but also electing work in education pertinent to college teaching, and who further are required to do supervised teaching at the college level. Demand for admission has been heavy.

The well-formed tree of learning will have both trunk and side branches. Although the different limbs may compete with one another for water and nutrients, for sunlight and carbon dioxide, yet the tree as a whole is healthier because of the multiplicity of parts.

There are clear needs for both types of new degrees. Jointly, they provide definitive academic goals for individuals who want to teach and who can develop a broad competence in a subject matter field, but whose professional interests may not be best satisfied by the type of scholarship required by the Ph.D. dissertation. Practically, the two together can materially increase the production of qualified college teachers, particularly at the underclass level.

The main trunk proposal, leading to the Candidate of Philosophy or a comparable degree, represents at least three years of work by students who originally aspired to the Doctor of Philosophy, and who were chosen as being qualified to work toward that degree by a graduate admissions committee. The possessors of such a mark of positive achievement should be well qualified to teach undergraduates, regardless of whether or not the teacher eventually completes his doctoral studies.

The side branch proposal, leading to the Master of Philosophy or a comparable degree (at least in the Cambridge, London, and Toronto sense) or to the Master of Arts in College Teaching degree, represents at least two years of work by students selected for that specific program (as distinct from the doctoral program). The possessors should be well qualified to teach underclass students, whether in community colleges or in four-year institutions. Whether or not a holder of such a degree should be permitted to continue on for the doctorate will and should be determined by the individual's total academic record, and not by his choice of a degree program at one point in his career.

To some extent, the requirement for supervised teaching in the M.A.C.T. concept is a separate issue. Whether we like it or not, college teaching is a major goal in the Ph.D. program as well. Furthermore, many departments in our major graduate schools already require an exposure to college teaching by their doctoral students—although the academic worth of such a requirement is somewhat colored by its convenience with regard to federal income tax regulations. I suggest, therefore, that any department be allowed to require supervised college teaching in any of the degree programs—the Ph.D., the Candidate in Philosophy, and the Master of Philosophy. Such teaching should not be unique to or characteristic of any individual degree program.

In summary, there appears to be widespread recognition of the academic justification for and the practical need of new degree programs to train college teachers in the sciences, humanities, and arts.

One portion of this need may properly be met by the affirmative recognition of achievement to the stage in the doctoral program marked by the passing of a comprehensive examination and the completion of essentially all requirements up to the doctoral dissertation. The degree Candidate in Philosophy appropriately marks this level of intermediate achievement, typically requiring three years of full-time study by Ph.D. students.

Another portion of the need may be met by a two-year terminal program leading to the Master in Philosophy or comparable degree. Such a program may well stress breadth rather than depth. It would be offered to a population of students separately admitted and supervised from those studying for the doctorate. Its caliber will be determined by the standards the institution sets and enforces.

Both types of programs are needed. We may disagree as to how they should be named, but we should not disagree about their appropriateness for institutions that choose to offer them.

PART
III
CHAPTER
10

Planning for better learning

SAMUEL N. POSTLETHWAIT

NEHEMIAH GREW WROTE, "Paradoxical as it may seem, there is nothing so constant as change." It would be equally paradoxical if leaders who prepare the younger generation to live in this changing world were themselves resistant to change. This would be like the general of an army who refused to do battle or a football team that refused to play football. However, this seemingly unlikely possibility really does exist. Few groups of people are so resistant to change as are teachers. Businessmen, farmers, entertainers, and many others have greeted the changes of this new, exciting world with enthusiasm and imagination. They have adapted their methods to meet the needs of a changing age. Why don't teachers do the same? Mostly we are victims of a system which evolved slowly so that the real objective of helping people learn was obscured by factors tangentially related to the process of education.

In retrospect it is easy to discern these factors, but practically it is an overwhelming task to overcome such a well-established system. Teachers, administrators, students, and parents have come to accept our current education system as a way of life, and each group brings pressure to maintain the status quo. Since we teachers are not dealing in a product dependent entirely on our efforts and our survival is not directly dependent on the quality of the product, the tendency is to succumb to these pressures and follow the line of least resistance.

Why swim upstream when the rewards are likely to be frustration and criticism? There are many good reasons. We are leaders! Whether we are good or poor, we are leading the younger generation, and what we do has an impact on their lives simply because of the nature of our position. Moral standards from every source demand that we make a sincere effort to help our students improve themselves. It would be unethical to do otherwise!

The proliferation of information and increased enrollments demand changes in our procedures no matter how strongly we resist. It is sheer folly to ignore the inevitable. To do so is to become obsolete.

Many factors which cause us difficulty in changing teaching methods are slowly being minimized or even eliminated altogether. Several colleges and universities are making positive strides toward the recognition of good teaching. An innovative teacher is being accepted as a worthy colleague by both fellow teachers and administrators. Money is being made available to support teaching projects from a great variety of sources. Publicity concerning some successful educational experiments has begun to reduce the prejudices that prejudiced teachers against some of the earlier experiments.

It is my conviction that we are in the lag phase of a growth curve in improvement of learning conditions. The hardware is available, we have some evidence of its potential, and many of us are now ready to redefine the problem and apply our best efforts to its solution.

The first step in planning for better instruction is to define the problem clearly. The problem in education stated in its simplest terms is "learning must be done by the learner." If this definition is correct, then the pathway to its solution is relatively evident. One should identify the kinds of activities in which a learner engages during the learning process and then structure situations which will permit the learner to engage in them. In the following paragraphs I would like to list some of these learning activities as I see them.

1. *Repetition.* There is little question but that the nature of many objectives requires repetition for their achievement. However, repetition ought to be engaged in in an intelligent fashion and adapted to the individual needs of a particular student. For example, a student who has learned about the Krebs cycle in high school biology has little need for extensive repetition of this study in a college biology course. On the other hand, a student who is encountering the Krebs cycle in his college biology course for the first time may find it necessary to repeat this study, or certain portions of it, a great many times. In a course with 500 students, the teacher cannot possibly make the adjustments in repetition for individual student needs. Only the student can determine intelligently how much repetition is necessary.

2. *Concentration.* Most classrooms are not organized to permit students to concentrate during their study. Students are distracting to one another, and other disassociated events which may be occurring tend to divert the student's attention from the subject at hand. The system should permit the student to isolate himself from the surrounding environment.

3. *Association.* In a study of plant science the major objective is to learn about plants. It makes sense, therefore, that a study of plants should be conducted where plants are available for observation. Diagrams, charts, models, photographs, and other such devices should be a means to the end that students' attention is directed to the literal plant itself.

4. *Appropriate sized units of subject matter.* People vary considerably in the amount of subject matter that they can grasp in a given amount of time. Programers have demonstrated that most people can learn almost anything if it is broken into small enough units and the student can take time to become informed about each unit before proceeding to the next. Any program of study therefore should provide each student an opportunity to adjust the size of the unit to his own ability to assimilate the information. This is especially important where the learning events are sequenced with subsequent events dependent on a mastery of preceding ones. The educator could well afford to learn from a successful construction engineer who pours a concrete foundation carefully shaped and positioned to support the

future structure and then permits this foundation adequate time to become fixed or firmed before placing on it the subsequent materials. Bricks and mortar are laid alternately with each brick and measure of mortar carefully placed to provide a bed for the positioning of the next bricks to be laid. Only in education do we pour forth the units of subject matter along with the cementing materials at a fixed rate, mixing together the bricks and mortar without regard to the many other factors which may affect the resultant organization.

5. *Adaptation of the nature of the communication vehicle to the nature of the objective.* A course such as botany is a complex of subject matter and requires a great variety of learning experiences. These may include the handling of a plant specimen, watching time-lapse film, viewing photographs, reading from textbooks, listening to a discussion by the senior instructor, visiting with colleagues, etc. It is logical, then, that no single vehicle such as lecturing or a textbook can achieve the full spectrum of objectives for this complex subject. In cases where the development of a procedural skill is necessary, there is no substitute for the student's doing this procedure himself. A properly structured course, therefore, would carefully define objectives and not try to mold objectives to fit a favorite medium (lecture, for example), but instead would use the medium best adapted to the nature of the objective.

6. *Use of multimedia.* Individuals differ in their responsiveness to different kinds of communication devices. Some people learn best through reading, others through auditory communication, and still others through handling specimens and experimentation. While some of my colleagues think that intellectual achievement is accomplished only through reading, it is my opinion that many poor readers are as intelligent as good readers and may become more knowledgeable than good readers if they are permitted exposure to subject matter through a communication vehicle more suited to their receptiveness. A good system should provide an opportunity for subject matter to be covered in a great variety of ways, with the student exploiting that medium which communicates most directly and effectively for him.

7. *Integration of learning events.* The conventional structuring of a lecture, recitation, and laboratory may expose a student on Monday to a lecture concerning a given subject. Perhaps on Wednesday the student does experiments related to the subject. On Friday a recitation will involve him in some exposure to the subject, and then on Sunday night, late, he may read on this subject from his text. A good educational system should permit the student to bring all of these learning experiences into an integrated sequence so that each learning event may enhance or complement the adjacent ones. One might compare this analogously to an orchestra. Many musical instruments making sounds in a random fashion result in noise or cacophony; however, these same sounds, if given timing and placed in an appropriate sequence or relationship, form a melody. I am suggesting that

there is a melody of learning and that teaching is, indeed, an art. It is the art of sequencing learning events into a meaningful experience for students.

We can approach change in a manner befitting one in the position of leadership. Mr. Gardner says that leadership demands a measure of confidence extending somewhat beyond that which the facts support. Not that facts are to be ignored, but leadership involves an attitude of inquiry and desire for progress which is at the opposite end of the spectrum from the nervous Nellie who waits for all the evidence to come in and thus avoids any personal responsibility for a decision.

An *honest* appraisal of course objectives often results in increased awareness of purpose and the identification of communication vehicles more directly related to the job to be accomplished. It also causes one to reflect more critically on the relevance of his evaluation procedures. (At a recent conference, I heard teachers proclaim strongly the need to encourage independent learning and, almost in the same breath, express their concern over students who were passing their course without attending lectures. If a student passes a test without attending lectures, one of two situations must prevail—either the test is not valid for the material presented in the lecture, or the student has been learning the material independently. If the former is the case, tests should be restructured; and if the latter is the case, the teacher should be pleased that the student is doing the independent learning he claims he wants.

The challenge is abundantly before us. The question that remains is merely one of position. Shall I change with the changing times and present to my students a dynamic and exciting image of the world, knowing fully well I may receive criticism from colleagues and the students themselves, or shall I stay with the nervous Nellies where there is security for the next few years and a great opportunity to complain about the increasing hordes of students and subject matter?

PART
III
CHAPTER
11

Alternatives to "up or out"

CHARLES E. STEARNS

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT TENSION in an academic community introduced by the polarizing effects of the ordinary human need for advancement, the local restrictions imposed by the need for distribution in age and rank, and the available budget.

Is it true that when we stop growing we are dead? Most of us need occasional reassurance by some overt recognition of continued growth. The chief means available to us are changes in rank and salary. In most institutions the first is the more overt, but it is available to us two or at most three times in an academic career. The second may be available more frequently, but it is less apparent. In an era of general inflation, it may be difficult or impossible to distinguish from general increases. Is a $400 increase reward for merit or standing still?

The colloquial phrase "up or out" stems from two principal systems of functioning under tension:

1. Some institutions may establish a fixed number of senior positions in the faculty or a fixed ratio of senior to junior positions. Unless the ratio be excessive, it follows that less than 100 percent of those appointed to junior rank can stay indefinitely. Even if they qualify, in the absence of an established vacancy in rank, they go "out."

2. Some institutions establish criteria for promotion to senior rank more extensive than those for first appointment and assume that, if promotion be not justified after a period in junior rank, a fellow goes out. There may be an apparent dissociation of promotion and tenure, by award of tenure to junior ranks. I think this must be more apparent than real where it occurs.

Some institutions may appear to do neither, either by clearly separating the award of tenure from promotion or by having no formal provisions for tenure. At the moment, however, recruitment and retention of good faculty seem to me more difficult for the institution than selection out for the faculty member. In the institution all too conscious that adequate replacement costs more than the bird-in-hand, there is no up or out problem.

Is it not, then, implicit in the phrase that we are talking about a faculty of which someone would like to be a permanent member, and that someone else in the faculty can make this impossible? First appointments are made in a probationary period, after which tenure (appointment without limit of time) is possible. The ratio between the probationary period and a lifetime of service, which is about one to seven, is a critical factor in the structure of a faculty. Let me suggest here that a formal concept of probation and tenure only makes retention or promotion to higher rank seem more serious. It is an open reminder of already existing conditions, not a new element.

During the last two decades, higher education itself and our own institutions in particular have undergone extensive and continuous change. I cannot believe that it will stop, although it may change in direction. Among its ingredients thus far have been (1) enormous expansion in size, (2) a general increase in quality, (3) a shift from salary structures which fifteen years ago could excite altruistic concern to structures more frankly related to living wages and market competition, and (4) very real changes in the individual characters of our institutions themselves.

For the last few years, we should have been conscious of some student disillusionment with the differences between the college they thought they were coming to and the one which they found. As elder statesmen, we may have smiled indulgently at this time-honored testimony to the changing views of adolescents. We have even pointed out the survival value of the phenomenon, which makes it easier to cut the apron strings at graduation.

But what of our own anachronistic views? Until recently, at least, faculty opinion has been more influential than the student view in many institutions. As change becomes a way of life instead of an occasional innovation, if our institutions become appropriately internally dynamic, will not our own views become increasingly anachronistic? All of us know the caricature of old Turk versus young Turk in a college faculty, and the acknowledged conservatism of the old Turk.

At my own institution, the mean Scholastic Achievement Test scores of entering freshmen in the college of liberal arts rose from 495 to 610 between 1950 and 1960, enough to make it clear to our admissions officers that SAT scores don't have all the answers! Many of us boasted of this kind of improvement until a few years ago, when it became fashionable to point to modest decreases in mean SAT scores as the real measure of selectivity. But the preceding change was enough to justify the flat statement that our student bodies are both more generally able and more substantially prepared. What concurrent changes in the faculty should we expect?

In the mean time, in my own institution, we undertook frank expansion of graduate work in the arts and sciences. We argued that the increased range of intellectual activity on the campus would make it more attractive to a more interesting faculty. The presence of graduate students, too, with their greater commitment (and statistically lesser ability), would open more credible vistas of what can be done to our undergraduates. We believe our arguments have been justified. As time goes on, we talk of blurring the lines between undergraduate and graduate student, although we have not yet found out just what that means.

What effect does institutional change have on personnel procedures? One effect on student admissions is very well known. My classmates are at least aware that we could no longer be admitted. Similarly, we have a saying within our faculty that our criterion for new appointments is simply that each appointment must be better than the last we made. Lacking SAT scores, this is more easily said than achieved. Can we use a similar criterion for retention and promotion?

Are there not subtle difficulties if the institution to which we invite a new colleague will be sensibly different by the end of his probationary period? To what extent can we recognize the qualities which make a young man both momentarily tolerant of the present condition and able to participate fully in its improvement? On the one hand, the institution to which he consciously accepted our invitation, and in which he would like to stay, may no longer be there. In a dynamic institution the young man may be an old Turk by the time a decision must be made. Conversely, unless we have changed with the institution (and not with our own view of it), we may misjudge his promise at the end of a probationary period precisely because the institution is changing in ways that we are not. In a dynamic faculty, the criteria for promotion and retention are probably changing with time. During the critical probationary period, can we keep them clearly before a young member of the faculty—and clearly before us? This, it seems to me, is the problem.

Let me now try some alternatives. And let me admit that I don't really believe that there are any acceptable ones!

Perhaps an *unranked faculty* might work. If everyone be instructor or everyone be professor, perhaps there is no up. Out, if it should occur, must be for other reasons. I have had no direct experience with such a faculty. Is there functional nonseniority as well as absence of title? Is it easier for a man to leave because of general incompetence than because he didn't deserve promotion to higher rank? Is it easier to reward continued growth by salary adjustments alone? Or is the public school our model, and by and large a discouraging one? I see no trend in this direction. Rather, as the rank of instructor disappears, I see new ranks appearing: senior professor, university professor, distinguished professor, etc.

In a ranked faculty, there must be "in and down." I don't suppost one could award tenure with actual decrease in rank (i.e., elect Assistant Professor So-and-So to be instructor without limit of time). I do know that the award of tenure without advance in rank (or honest expectation of promotion in the near future, which is the same thing) is functionally the same thing. It is as hurtful, and if the hurt be not so immediately apparent, it can be hurtful without limit of time.

The hurt may be less, or seem less public, in a doubly ranked faculty, such as a faculty with two salary scales in the higher ranks. Many of us live in such institutions, except that the two scales are blurred (but not concealed) by intermediate salaries. Instead of first-class and second-class citizens, we have a complex, stratified society. It is nonetheless stratified. I see no evidence that the master teacher-associate teacher relationship is a continuously happy one for the second-class teacher.

Can we *eliminate the probationary period,* i.e., make all initial appointments without limit of time? Few of us have such confidence in our initial selection procedures. If budget limitations be too severe, this is of course what we do. If our better young men consistently move out and up, our senior citizens have moved in neither direction. They are trapped, and they know it. Someone had better do something about the budget.

No, I do not see any real alternatives except those which expediency forces on us. If higher education be as dynamic as the society it serves, the chief alternative to up or out is a firm commitment to the status quo. If the function of a faculty be to preserve the status quo in a fluid society, this may be a good thing. If the function of a faculty be to preserve vision, to anticipate the future in the presence of respect for the past, to stimulate intellectual growth by continuous example, up or out may be our only safety valve. The problem before us is maintenance of standards of decency in dealing honestly with our fellowmen, not standards of excellence or of achievement.

Why evaluate?

LOUIS LONG

PART III CHAPTER 12

IT IS GENERALLY ACCEPTED, in principle, that participation of all concerned in decision-making is a part of the American democratic way of life. In practice, we find ourselves constantly taken by surprise that this particular situation is one in which participation by these particular people is being demanded. It is an uncomfortable jolt to find that a hitherto passive recipient of the decision-making process is suddenly pressing his claims as a co-decision-maker. We are experiencing in this phenomenon the stretching of the democratic concept to cover areas to which the concept did not seem applicable. We are seeing more and more people in more and more roles thinking of themselves as legitimate participants in a democratic process. This is true in government, in industry, in community service activities, in family living, and in education.

My topic deals with a specific area in education in which democracy is being tested: the questioning by students of the traditionally accepted principle that it is the teacher who evaluates the student. Of course students have always informally evaluated teachers, but they now seek to make a formal evaluation which will not merely be an exercise, but which will have an impact upon the administration and hopefully result in an improvement in college teaching.

The student's demand to evaluate faculty attempts to right what is in his eyes, and what may very likely be, wrong: namely, the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of college teaching. Assuming for the moment that the student is right (an effort that it is salutary to make) and that college teaching has measurable defects, we can speculate a moment on why now happens to be the time when the student is mentioning it more emphatically. Not only may college teaching be really worse than it has been in the past, but by contrast with the improvement in the quality of primary and secondary teaching, its defects may be more noticeable. Would it not be fair to say that in our colleges, especially those involved in graduate training, the emphasis is on scholarly activity (too often defined in terms of quantity with only a passing emphasis on quality)? "Publish or perish" is still an appropriate phrase, and the recent rating of graduate schools will keep this concept alive. At the same time there is more talk about putting greater emphasis on teaching effectiveness, but in most institutions this is still mostly talk. College instruction has traditionally stressed content and let the process of teaching fend for itself, whereas elementary and secondary teaching has increasingly concerned itself with the teaching process. This is not to suggest that colleges should necessarily move in the direction of school-of-education process teaching, but rather that colleges should be more concerned about finding still better ways of helping their instructors to present content.

Before an evaluation program of any kind is planned, a clear statement of its purpose must be developed. What is the intent of the program? What is to be accomplished by it? It is extremely important that the purposes be stated in a frank and open fashion. Any appearance of the hidden agenda approach will have a very adverse effect on the program.

Let me review some of the possible purposes of a faculty evaluation program.

1. Self-improvement. One purpose of the program can be to feed back information to the indivdual faculty member that will help him improve his teaching effectiveness.

2. Helping in the determination of initial appointment or reappointment, tenure granting, or promotion. In this situation the evaluation becomes compulsory, with the results being made known to departmental chairmen, committees on appointments, deans, etc. There are a whole host of problems involved. Implementation of a program of this kind is a very complex affair. Combining data relating to teaching effectiveness with other information that should be considered when making decisions of this kind is part of the problem.

3. Enabling comparisons to be made between departments or units within a college or university. Such data would conceivably be useful to deans, presidents, and other college administrators. High school seniors and high school advisors might also use it in evaluating units within a college.

4. Guiding students in the selection of instructors or courses. The production of the well known handbooks published by students at Yale, Harvard, University of California, Stanford, etc., are good examples.

I would like to focus on self-improvement as the purpose of faculty evaluation and discuss the questionnaire approach as a method being widely used in colleges throughout the country. I shall draw heavily upon my experience at City College, where we are currently using a teacher-evaluation questionnaire as a means of helping the instructor teaching undergraduates to evaluate his own teaching effectiveness. This is a student government initiated project, financed jointly by student government and the College. A student-faculty committee has handled all phases of the project: defining the purposes, constructing the questionnaire, determining how it will be used, deciding what will be reported back to the instructor participating, and planning the summary report to be distributed to the members of the college community.

Participation is on a voluntary basis, with a clear understanding that a confidential report will be submitted to each participant. Efforts are being made to create the kind of atmosphere that will encourage instructors to use the instrument. My own feeling is that this is a good beginning and can be said to constitute a faculty evaluation program. But why stop with evaluation; why evaluate? Evaluation, in and of itself, may lead to very little in the way of improvement in the effectiveness of instruction. To make the program more meaningful, we need to do two things: spend more time and effort on researching the approach we are now using and build into the plan a follow-up procedure.

In research we need to (a) find out more about how helpful the questionnaire approach is to the instructor—how much he is getting out of it, how helpful it is to him, what ideas he has about how it can be made more useful, etc.; (b) find out more about what the typical student thinks about the questionnaire and what suggestions he has about making it more effective; (c) explore ways and means of communicating the results to the instructor, such as what data will be most helpful and meaningful to him; (d) study ways of improving the questionnaire itself, such as use of objective questions versus write-in or free responses, the form of the questions, areas covered, etc.; and (e) determine more precisely the relationship between ratings students give and variables such as grade expected in course, over-all grade point average, class, age, sex, elective versus required courses, etc. It would seem that these relationships need to be established for each institution.

A follow-up program has not yet been developed at City College. The College needs to develop a systematic way of helping those instructors who would like to talk with someone about their ratings. I propose that a few individuals in the college community be designated to work with staff members interested in discussing their ratings (what they mean and how one goes about modifying or changing one's method of teaching). This consultative group should include outstanding scholars in their own discipline who are known for their ability to work with their colleagues (I like to picture them as Mr. Chips or Dean Hawkes). Students, carefully selected, should also serve as members of this consultative group. From time to time the consultative group might get together ten or twelve faculty members who are seeking help with their teaching for a seminar on teaching effectiveness. This will be a more meaningful program if students are an integrated part of it. Their point of view will be helpful. They will have unique contributions to make. The course outline of the seminar could vary greatly, but any of the following would be appropriate:

1. Class visitation. A member of the consultative group might invite a seminar member to sit in on a class the former is teaching, and vice versa. (Inviting the student member of the consultative group to sit in on a class should also be considered.) After such a visitation the persons could review and evaluate the class presentation.

2. Examples of oustanding teaching. Occasionally the consultative group might ask an outstanding instructor to invite members of the seminar to sit in on his class and then have him join the seminar for a session in which he discussed his approach to teaching (method, philosophy, etc.).

3. Use of tape recordings, closed circuit TV, and videotape. The use of any of these would be an effective way of stimulating a discussion of the art of teaching. Poor examples, as well as outstanding examples, could be used to good advantage.

The members of the seminar will of necessity become involved in a discussion of just how one defines teaching effectiveness—how does one identify the good teacher; what makes a teacher a really great teacher? Evaluation will continue to be a problem, since objective criteria and scientific evaluation will probably never be developed to the point of enabling teaching to be measured in a mechancial way.

Although City College does not have a follow-up on its evaluation, the College did at one time have a program that might serve as a model. For several years a teaching internship program operated during our summer sessions. This was highly successful, and those interested may want to look at an article published by Samuel Middlebrook in a 1961 issue of the *AAUP Bulletin*. In essence, this program oriented new and inexperienced instructors to the college. It also dealt with grading practices, student reactions, teaching effectiveness, etc. A forum was provided for young instructors to discuss openly the problems they encountered in the classroom (how demanding to be, how to set standards, how to handle the aggressive and dominant student, how to encourage participation in class discussion). Class visitation was an integrated part of the program, as was the use of models of effective teaching. The young instructors were also encouraged to use the questionnaire approach in getting evaluations from their own students.

I feel strongly that evaluation without follow-up can be sterile. As I moved from evaluation to follow-up I have continued to urge student involvement.

First of all, I am responding to the current demand of the student groups to participate more in the decision-making of a college, with the expressed purpose of bringing about an improvement in all phases of the educational process. Faculty evaluation is an area in which they are interested. It is also an area in which I think they have a contribution to make. So their involvement in this process is natural. However, their interest often stops at the evaluation stage. As a result, there is the urge to administer a questionnaire term after term. Why? The rating procedure yields numbers and figures. This is an accomplishment and is newsworthy—often considered so by both campus and metropolitan newspapers.

Part of our job is to help students evaluate their activity. Helping them see that an evaluation program aimed at self-improvement is not likely to accomplish much unless there is a built-in follow-up may prevent them from becoming disillusioned, which in turn can lead to a feeling that publicized ratings (white and black lists) are necessary if change is to come about. At some colleges such a development on the part of the students would do real damage to any self-improvement program. I would like to encourage students to move from the evaluation process to the follow-up kind of program described above. I would like to see them tackle creatively the problem of what kind of follow-up program can be planned and how they, as individuals, can help an instructor who is seeking to improve his teaching effectiveness. Confrontation with this kind of question from an instructor will cause a student to think long and hard about what good teaching is, and it may even result in a greater appreciation of some of the problems of teaching. More understanding of the role of the teacher and of the teaching process will certainly develop. If, by chance, some of the students eventually move into teaching, I am sure they will be the better for it.

PART IV

BROADER VISIONS OF LEADERSHIP

Leadership in a time of educational change

PART
IV
CHAPTER
1

SAMUEL B. GOULD

THE MOST STRIKING CHARACTERISTIC of our time is *change,* rapid and even breath-taking change. Eric Hoffer, in *The Temper of Our Time* (New York, New York: Harper & Row, 1966), identifies drastic change as "the main difficulty and challenge of our age—from backwardness to modernity, from subjection to equality, from poverty to affluence, from work to leisure. These are all highly desirable changes, changes that mankind has hoped and prayed for through the millennia. Yet it is becoming evident that, no matter how desirable, drastic change is the most difficult and dangerous experience mankind has undergone. We are discovering that broken habits can be more painful and crippling than broken bones, and that disintegrating values may have as deadly a fallout as disintegrating atoms."

When Mr. Hoffer speaks of drastic change taking place generally in our society, he does not mention education specifically. Yet what he says raises for us in the academic world the specter of a two-headed monster with which we must all struggle: the sweeping and revolutionary changes necessary to the process of education if it is to meet today's and tomorrow's needs effectively, and the equally impelling necessity for explaining as part of our educational responsibility to young and old alike the nature of the societal transformation going on all around us. We must change ourselves and at the same time be the foremost interpreters of change. This is no small task, yet its two parts constitute our most important concern. To neglect either one is to court tragedy.

I shall concentrate upon the first, and let me quickly identify the main points I shall discuss. These are the change in the nature of our educational institutions, the emergence of a new type of educational leader as a result of these institutional changes, the change in attitudes toward leadership on present-day campuses, and the newly recognized elements of university life which appear imminent.

Much more is happening to colleges and universities than a mere increase in size, although much of what is taking place has had the pressure of numbers as a motivating force toward change. The increase in numbers represents not only a surging population but a stronger desire for a college education by a larger percentage of college-age youth, coupled with a steady movement toward acceptance of the principle that all who can benefit from more education should have it. The junior or community college movement is spreading to the point where soon more than one-half of the students entering college will be attending these institutions. New methods of instruction and new devices to aid instruction and research are commanding attention as never before; these explorations have great implications for the curricula and structures of colleges and universities of the future. The financial rewards for the teacher are improving wherever one looks; conversely, the availability of fully qualified and unusually able teachers is becoming more and more of a problem. And finally, the involvement of universities in public service of many types is drawing the academic world and the community together with new commonalities of interest.

We see, therefore, all around us a new preoccupation with very specific developments. I have already mentioned community colleges and new curricular patterns. We can easily add other specifics. Continuing education is one; university involvement in urban affairs is another. The relationship of Peace Corps activities to education is still another, for only in rare instances have there as yet been truly close linkages between this pragmatic use of student idealism and the regular academic life of a college or university. International education, in spite of its growth, still has many weaknesses and temptations to be overcome. Teacher education needs a most thorough re-examination as a forerunner to removing from much of it the stigma of academic flabbiness which has haunted it for so many years. And more recently there have been unmistakable stirrings over the place of the university in the development of the fine and performing arts in our society.

These are some of the outward signs we can all distinguish; one could easily add to the list. But there are other characteristics of change in colleges and universities, both private and public. Among private institutions, especially the smaller ones, one of these is a banding together into coordinated groups for purposes of gaining collective strength, sharing facilities and personnel, and often participating in curricular development which no single one of the institutions could encompass by itself. Among public institutions, another major shift is the proliferation of campuses. Having reached a point of growth where twenty or thirty thousand students are massed on a single campus, universities are tending more and more to create branches which ultimately have a certain autonomy of their own, instead of opening completely new institutions. The advantages of this approach in time, in allocation of funds, and in the experience that can be called upon from existing campuses are readily seen. There are also disadvantages, of course.

As this trend continues, institutional systems are being established, instead of single institutions being perpetuated. In public higher education these systems are becoming statewide; indeed, in some states the coordinating principle is expanding to include *all* colleges and universities. Nor is this simply coordination through academic representatives; it is more and more through lay boards and even super boards.

Obviously, the changing characteristics of our institutions, and particularly their growth into systems, has great effect upon the educational leadership demands and responsibilities. In addition to the traditional sort of leadership exerted on the single campus (one with which we are all familiar), a new dimension has become visible, namely the leadership of a system or a combination of campuses or colleges. And this is leadership of a different sort even though it is based upon the same educational considerations that have always concerned us. It is educational, but it is also managerial; its managerial aspects, however, are tempered and made more difficult by the unmistakable and immutable peculiarities of the academic world.

As a result, the educational leader of a university system is constantly asking himself questions such as these: "How can I create internally and externally a climate for acceptance of change, realizing as I do that the change will come, and all too swiftly?" He faces the double duty of persuading administrators, faculties, and students on all his campuses to welcome the necessities for change, and of persuading executive and legislative authorities that they must be willing and ready to support these necessities. "How can I substitute new approaches to learning rather than have them merely piled upon the old?" He knows the time-honored tendency to retain all that exists in a curriculum or departmental structure even when new elements are introduced; he knows also what this means in cost and facilities use. "How can I expect existing campuses within my system to change very much or rapidly enough to meet contemporary need when I know so well the innate conservatism of faculties?" The rights and responsibilities of faculties in this regard are unchallengeable and must be honored. "How can I plot the course of my institution for years ahead without frightening everyone concerned by the implications of my planning and without driving them toward a state of militant opposition?" He is well aware that when he tells the truth about what will be required years hence, he will cause consternation among many and will engender open defiance from some.

Furthermore, this new breed of educational leader is one long step removed from his counterparts on individual campuses or at individual institutions. He has no regular and frequent relationships with faculties or with students; indeed, he must be assiduous in fostering local autonomy so that the head of the local campus is in every sense its educational leader. He visits his various constituencies only by invitation (if he is wise), and even then most often in relation to some ritualistic event. Almost inevitably he thus becomes a species of mystical figure with much shadow and little substance, remote and aloof, presenting one tiny particle of his responsibility and his personality to each separate group or individual he meets and thus becoming something different to each one. And, of course, as the representation of centralized authority, he is the scapegoat for whatever turns out badly in any part of the academic domain. Because he is so isolated from campus life, he is in danger of forgetting the true meaning of his own daily responsibilities: the supervision of physical growth, the long-range planning process, the relationships with boards of control, the acquisition of financial resources, the interpretation of university aims and policies, the guiding and strengthening of the recruiting process, the protection of the university from political and other unwarranted interference. Yet in all these matters and more, he must be in constant communication with campus leaders, whether administrative, faculty, or student, in order that they may understand and come to terms with the general movement, the missions, and the aspirations of the university as a system.

Whether we think about new or old breeds of educational leaders, however, we certainly know that campus attitudes toward *any* sort of leadership are changing. Faculties to some extent and students to a very large extent are raising their voices more and more strongly; and while the message is not always completely clear, it is there for all to hear. Students in particular have become cynical about all forms of leadership, and in some cases are advocating what amounts to anarchy. They were at first preoccupied with the restrictive elements of law or, in fact, any type of regulation. Now they are questioning the necessity or desirability of any kind of orderly process. And while this is an extremist view, its impact should not be minimized. It will find an increasing number of disciples, particularly as we in the so-called adult academic world continue our dilatory and snail-like progress toward adapting ourselves and our institutions to a drastically changing society. As Louis Benezet said so colorfully, the students shout, "Relevance!" at us, and we shout back, "Responsibility!" But there are those who see no connection between the two, and who feel their only responsibility is to be deliberately disruptive. There is serious question as to whether there is any possibility of coming to terms of any sort with such a philosophy; the answer is very probably that there is no such possibility. Yet there are ways to increase the measure of student involvement in patterns that can satisfy their legitimate requests, patterns that add strength to our institutions of learning and, indeed, to the total democratic process. To find these patterns is a serious and immediate task for the present-day educational leader.

As to faculty and students together, the time has come for a truly unequivocal delineation of where the responsibility for educational leadership properly belongs and in what degree different parts of the academic community share it. Practical considerations make it plain that the president's function of educational leadership is one which he cannot and should not undertake unilaterally. To begin with, it is beyond his mental and physical resources to do so; moreover, such an approach is destined to failure. Thus, he must call upon the talents and experience of the faculty as well as their primary concern for academic development and, to a lesser but significant extent, upon the experience of the students as the ones most directly and most quickly affected by educational change. It is the responsibility of the faculty to think deeply about the academic aspects of the institution, not only in terms of their own disciplines but in broader connotations as well; it is the responsibility of the students to add as their contribution an evaluation of the effectiveness of what is being done and to make suggestions for improvement. The ultimate responsibility for encouraging and coordinating all such recommendations, however, remains with the president, particularly since total resources are always limited and priorities must always be set.

This is a statement with which some segments of the faculty or some groups of students are inclined to take issue, and so I must explain my position. I base it upon what I shall call, for lack of a better term, the mandate of accountability, a phenomenon of life that goes far beyond the inner workings of the academic world. It is the basis for law and order and the curb upon individual action. It is the only proper limitation upon such action, whether in the family, in social and political life, indeed in every aspect of human relationships. Simply stated, it is the conviction that when something is done, someone must be held accountable for the consequences.

At first glance such a theory does not appear to be unusual or to present many problems. In political life, for example, the actions of elected officials are always subject to the scrutiny of the electorate, and as a result, shifts in party control and in personalities occur with reasonable regularity. In the business world the emphasis upon accountability is even more evident and changes can be even swifter and more sweeping. In our everyday relationships to one another in society, we make judgments and perform actions in the clear knowledge that we shall be held responsible for these, either through the workings of law or through the reactions of our associates. There is never any question as to who permitted or initiated the action, and thus there is never any question as to who is accountable.

In academic life the same theory must exist to avoid chaos. The participation of faculty and students in academic and other matters pertaining to the institution is not only to be encouraged but is, indeed, essential for the shaping of appropriate decisions. But the consequences of such participation and such decisions fall squarely upon the shoulders of one man alone—the president, acting under the delegated authority of his board of trustees. A series of wrong decisions reflects upon him and no one else. He cannot place even part of the blame for any blunders upon faculty or students, since individually they often cannot even be identified for their part in recommending or advising or deciding. He is the only accountable person.

Accountability is not so readily understood and is not so clear in the college or university as in other walks of life, however. The academic structure has within it elements that sometimes make accountability more difficult to apply or even to identify. In the first place, we call upon faculty and sometimes upon students to serve on committees dealing with subjects outside their normal range of competence. Their judgments on such matters are almost always of great value, but this does not mean they should be binding. To argue otherwise would be to advocate a species of amateurism as the guiding philosophy of the institution. In the second place, there are built-in protections in university life—tenure for faculty, to name only one

—that make the problem even more complex. These protections are appropriate, but they cause confusion when they are used for purposes other than those for which they were designed.

And thirdly, one must not forget the tremendous power wielded by faculties, stemming from what I shall call the authority of inertia. Faculty opposition to a proposed plan of action, or even reluctance on their part to try it, is sufficient to slow down any change with an effectiveness that far outweighs the decision-making power. Nor does this opposition or reluctance need to be avowed openly; it can exhibit itself in more subtle ways, and sometimes does. If there were time, we could examine the whole committee process, for example, as it exerts this authority I speak of and as it relates to accountability.

Educational leadership exists in a new era, therefore, surrounded and affected by a new set of circumstances. It is undergoing change along with everything else in our academic world. As an interpreter of such change, what should it now be doing to point the way, to take our society toward new directions and new educational necessities? What is the university of the future to be, and wherein will it differ from what we now live with and know?

The conditions under which our society will live in the decades ahead are readily identifiable. First and foremost among these is *the continuation of the movement toward increased equality of opportunity for all;* in such a movement, education is a prime factor, and as time goes on, *higher* education will be the goal for more and more of our youth. Education beyond the high school will involve a far higher percentage of our college-age men and women. Twenty years ago it included about 20 percent; today it is approaching 40 percent; twenty years hence it will include at least 60 percent. And mass education of this magnitude is bound to be supported more and more by public funds.

But there are other factors that will affect higher education both in size and character, and I can only touch upon them briefly. We must bear in mind, for example, *the creation of increased leisure time for so many of our citizenry*. Automation is making us reassess not only the nature of our work in the future, but also the time it will take to do it. In spite of the fears presently being expressed as to what such a process does to our civilization, we must not forget that we have here one of the great liberating forces for mankind. Our old concepts of human labor are being threatened, and perhaps it is all to the good that they are. The various forms of automation raise man's potential, releasing him from drudgery.

It will be inevitable, I believe, that as this leisure time becomes available, the responsibility of education to help fill it will become more marked. A system of continuing education for all, regardless of age and circumstances, will become one of the most rapidly expanding elements of the future. Such a system will reach new heights of flexibility and will touch upon every facet of cultural and educational life. It will necessarily be highly individualized, as indeed will all of education in the future, and will create a new kind of citizenry with broader interests and new motivations for self-fulfillment.

Automation is only one manifestation of the role of technology today. *The continuing discoveries of science* will give higher education new challenges to meet if it is to prepare students adequately. And as a handmaiden to these discoveries the computer as a technological tool will reshape many aspects of our society, giving us a speed in acquisition of knowledge and in problem-solving we thought impossible only a few years ago. Every part of our lives will be touched. With man's knowledge of his world and universe doubling every ten years, we shall have to re-evaluate completely the purposes and methods of education.

The virtual disappearance of unskilled human labor will place still another burden upon higher education. The demands of the future will be for *skilled* workers in all fields, for a huge increase in technicians as well as the more professionally trained. And higher education will be expected to provide the training. Every formal discussion of manpower needs and the training necessary to meet those needs culminates in agreement that our colleges and universities must play a major role in providing the great reservoir of human ability which our country and the world wish to tap. Business, industry, the health professions in all their diversity, public agencies, even cultural groups—all have the same basic request and all make it to the institution that represents higher education.

It is evident also that we shall never again see the day when there are enough buildings or other educational facilities and enough faculty to take care of the country's needs. Even the most massive kinds of building or recruiting programs will not bring us to a point of proper balance. And on the recruitment side, the problem is not merely that of numbers but also the quality of those recruited.

With such conditions prevailing, *new approaches must be sought both in the use of facilities and in the learning process itself.* We must start asking ourselves whether every aspect of higher education needs to be carried out on a campus; whether the home cannot be utilized more; whether television, radio, and other communication techniques should not be employed more widely to ease the strain on facilities and to expose master teachers to most students; whether the present concept of relaying knowledge in the classroom and lecture hall is a valid one or whether the times and educational philosophy do not, in fact, call for more independent study for the student. We must also re-examine the entire recruiting process, the degree requirements and certification requirements for teachers and how these were originally created, the ways by which men and women of ability can be attracted to the teaching profession—these are only illustrative of how radically changed our traditional attitudes and presuppositions must become. The problem of insufficient faculty will lead eventually to active assistance to our educational systems from citizens generally at all levels such as we have never dreamed of before. I will predict that within a few decades one out of every two adults in this country will in some way be close to the educational process, either through studying or teaching, or both. And what may have started as a crisis move may turn out to be a permanent characteristic of our civilization, contributing importantly to the democratic ideal.

We already see all around us the ways by which the world is growing smaller. We see what the advances in transportation are doing to draw the people of many countries closer together, whether for economic or other reasons. We see how the discoveries of science cross the boundaries of nations and how the exchange of cultural achievements gives new insights into the thought and motivations of other countries. We see the fumbling but nonetheless important efforts toward a kind of world citizenship brought about through our fears of mass annihilation. The logic of peace is more unmistakable than ever, although it is too often couched in overidealistic language. Essentially we are discovering what we, in fact, have always known: that peace is based upon mutual trust, that trust is based upon knowledge of one another, that knowledge comes about through thorough study and face-to-face experience.

It is through our educational patterns of the next several decades that we have the surest path toward peace, even though uneasy victories may be won meanwhile in the short run because of practical necessities. And as is the case in so many other areas of life, the university and education generally will have to bear the brunt of responsibility in *preparing men and women for world peace efforts* that are more permanent in possibility because they are based on more humane understanding.

With these conditions of society ahead of us and with education so much involved, the image of the university of tomorrow becomes reasonably clear, whether one thinks of its philosophical, structural, sociological, or other manifestations.

Such a university is bound to be far less structured and far more flexible than it has been. It will be geared to fulfilling the needs of individuals more than ever before, and will place less store upon the formalized patterns so long sacrosanct. People of all ages and conditions will move about within and around it more freely, taking from it what they require without giving so much attention to degrees and course credits. The prestige of university attendance will decline as a symbol of status because education will become part of the normal continuing pattern of existence. A much larger percentage of the university population will be seeking knowledge for its own sake, rather than as a way to join the degree hierarchy. Only the most advanced degrees will have significance. And for everyone who comes to the university, competence rather than course credits will be the basis of measuring progress.

The university will be far more interested in expounding the principles and philosophy underlying a body of knowledge and skills than in the knowledge itself. The latter will be left to the student to search out and master for himself. In a society where skills become obsolescent with almost breath-taking rapidity, and where knowledge increases by geometric proportions from year to year, it cannot be otherwise. Electronic means of storing and retrieving knowledge will speed up this part of the learning process and make possible more concentration in depth upon the significance of that knowledge. This will, in turn, affect the techniques of teaching, since it will open wider the door to opportunities for creative discussion and experimentation.

The electronic means for aiding the learning process, whether we think of those already in use or those still to be devised, will amplify the opportunities for great teachers to reach many more students than heretofore. They will reach them in large or small groups or even individually, since a student will be able to select the prerecorded lecture or demonstration he wishes and use it at his own convenience (and more than once, if this is necessary for him). The old formal lines that have always marked higher education (the two-year or four-year pattern for graduation, for example) will disappear, and students will progress toward a degree or toward completion of a course of study at the rate of speed most suitable to their individual needs. Furthermore, there will be such a high degree of cooperation and coordination among educational institutions, private and public alike, in the sharing of faculties, facilities, and programs that students will move rather freely from institution to institution within the region.

The continuing development of our urban civilization will cause the university of the future to be relatively large and located in a thickly populated area. It will also be located near research and cultural agencies of the community and will carry on its work in close association with them. The physical attributes of such a university will be those necessary for learning rather than for living. Most students will live at home, or at least be responsible for their own living necessities. Obviously, under such circumstances the time-honored American college and university concept of *in loco parentis* will disappear. The university will emphasize human values in education through its programs of study and the daily contacts between students and faculty, rather than through its residential arrangements. Thus, the independence of the student and recognition of his capabilities as a mature being will be increasingly emphasized; so, also, will his accountability for the consequences of his actions be increased.

It is clear that the university as I have described it will find it difficult to maintain the old sentimental attachments to its alumni and friends. Students will turn to so many different resources in carrying on their education (including more than one educational institution) that they will be far less sure about where their sentimental loyalties lie. They will, however, be infinitely more loyal to the concept of education for all, wherever and in whatever manner it is acquired. I shall not dare to predict what this new pattern may do to intercollegiate football; this is a phase of development I have not examined carefully. I *could* remind you of Robert Hutchins' rather fanciful suggestion made many years ago that universities each acquire a string of race horses and run them in competition on Saturday afternoons; this would obviate the necessity for worrying about the scholastic standings of the participants and would still leave open the income-producing possibility for the institutions, as well as satisfying the chauvinistic tendencies of alumni. (Mind you, I am not recommending this; I am merely reporting a suggestion.)

The global aspects of the university will become steadily more apparent. More and more students will travel to other parts of the world for a portion of their education, and faculty from other countries will exchange with our own more frequently. Associations between universities of different countries will increase, and our own universities will concentrate a good portion of their service activities on assisting underdeveloped countries to newer and higher standards of achievement. Out of this may perhaps come a sturdier foundation upon which hopes for world peace can be built. If the theories of certain anthropologists and other behavioral scientists are correct—that the desire to dominate is an innate characteristic of human life and can be traced through thousands of years—then we have cause to wonder how successful we shall be. We can only hope and, while doing so, work mightily to broaden world understandings among all the nations.

To lead higher education in new directions such as those I have just attempted to describe is imperative but more difficult than ever. The campuses and the campus climate in which leadership must take place offer problems and obstacles of great complexity. Part of our democratic heritage, accentuated in the past decade or two, is to yearn mightily for leadership and then to array oneself against it whenever it appears. The genius of the leadership of the future, therefore, will be in the persuasive power it can exert, rather than in its directorial authority. And this, after all, is the highest quality of leadership, since it guarantees acceptance from those who follow.

The university is vital in any society, but in a democracy it is priceless. We must nourish it, guard it, cherish it as our main harbinger of hope. If the world is to prosper and be more humane as it does so, it will need the university as never before, since we now live in a time when ignorance is unthinkable and unacceptable not only for its grossness but for its danger. Whatever forms it may take, whatever changes it undergoes, the university is the centrality in which the promise of mankind is nurtured and brought closer to reality. With intelligent, sensitive, dedicated, and courageous leadership it can create a more enlightened America and a more enlightened world.

The policy-making role of trustees in church-related colleges

PART IV CHAPTER 2

ALFRED D. DONOVAN

IN RECENT MONTHS a dozen or more Catholic universities and colleges have announced changes in their boards of control. Doubtless many others will follow. From what has already been announced, it is clear that forthcoming changes will be widespread and highly significant. The role of boards of control in many Catholic institutions is in a state of flux, and that role will be profoundly different in the years ahead from what it presently is.

The phrasing of the topic for this paper implies that the role of these boards is different from those of other independent institutions. It is my thesis that, except with respect to matters which deeply affect the religious character of the institutions, the role of church-related boards should not be essentially different from that of independent nonchurch-related boards, although I hasten to add that it frequently has been or, at least, the way in which the role has been filled certainly has. The changes which have been announced will surely reduce, and in some instances remove, those differences.

When the federal or state government charters a corporation, it creates before the law what is in effect a person who has many, though obviously not all, of the prerogatives of a natural person. Because the corporation's personality is only a legal fiction, it is necessary to provide some agency composed of human persons to govern its affairs. This, of course, is the function of boards of control, by whatever name they may be called.

All the inherent powers of a corporation, whether express or implied by its charter, resides in its board of control. Among such powers are those to acquire, mortgage, and sell real property, to decide and establish the basic policies of the institution, to employ a chief executive officer and delegate broad responsibilities to him, and to preserve the assets and financial stability of the institution. So far as civil law is concerned, practically all educational corporate boards have these powers and can legally exercise them without the approval of higher or outside authority. In the case of many Catholic institutions, however, the specific exercise of some of these powers, such as the acquisition or disposal of real property, for example, is subject to the approval of cognizant church authorities such as the local bishop and superiors of the religious order or community.

It has long been the tradition in most Catholic colleges conducted by religious orders to restrict election to boards of control to members of the order. Frequently a number of such members are ex officio, depending on some administrative or other office they hold. It is not unusual for a majority or all members of such boards to reside on the same campus. The shortcomings of this system are obvious. Sitting as a board member, a person is expected to consider the acceptability of policies and proposals which he himself as an administrator or teacher has helped formulate. This has tended to convert the board of control into little more than an administrative council whose point of view is something less than objective. The role of such boards is sometimes little more than that of a rubber stamp.

The management of a contemporary college is a difficult and complex operation. The problems it entails are never exclusively educational, and usually are not even principally so. To analyze, appreciate, and solve these varied problems demands the best efforts of people of talents, backgrounds, and experiences. Not every religious community has within its membership enough men and women who have the necessary backgrounds or experiences to meet these problems satisfactorily. In this situation, a college whose board is restricted to members of the community is deprived of very valuable assistance it could otherwise have.

Many Catholic colleges are hard-pressed financially—a situation which is likely to be aggravated in the years ahead. Some of these institutions will probably be forced out of existence for lack of resources to maintain them. Those which survive will need to have trustees who can develop sources of contributions and who will themselves contribute to the best of their ability. If boards are to fulfill their role in this respect, it seems clear that they cannot be composed exclusively of priests and nuns who have taken vows of personal poverty.

A number of Catholic institutions sought a partial solution to the problem by setting up lay advisory boards. In most instances these boards had little or, at best, mixed success. The main difficulty lay in the fact that, while these boards were expected to offer counsel, they did not in fact have any responsibility or authority to put into effect what they had advised. Men of the highest caliber will not long maintain an active interest under these conditions.

The University of Notre Dame had presented a notable exception to the common run of lay advisory boards without genuine responsibilities. Two decades ago its board of clerical trustees gave its lay board title to the University's endowment funds and exclusive control over them. It is scarcely fortuitous that in twenty years Notre Dame raised more than $100 million, and its endowment fund increased more than twelve-fold. This experience demonstrated what laymen can accomplish in behalf of a Catholic university when their role gives them control over a part of its affairs. It was difficult for one to escape speculation as to what laymen might accomplish if they were given a share in the control of its other affairs as well.

Thus, for a long time before 1962, there had been a growing awareness in numerous Catholic institutions of the necessity of reforming their governance. The larger institutions, particularly, had seen their lay faculties increase to the point where they not infrequently outnumbered clerical members by as much as ten to one. The number of lay administrators in these institutions had also been increasing, though at a somewhat slower rate. The deficiencies of exclusively clerical boards were widely recognized. There was the example at Notre Dame of what laymen can accomplish if given the opportunity and authority. Still, old traditions die slowly. Religious orders were reluctant to relinquish or share control of the colleges and universities conducted under their aegis. After all, control is one attribute of ownership. Why, it was asked, should the order give away or share control of property for which members of the order had long labored? There was deep concern that giving laymen a measure of control would radically change the schools' character and convert them into institutions which would be out of harmony with the traditions and spirit of the order, with the very purposes for which the institutions had been founded.

The Second Vatican Council, which began its sessions in the fall of 1962, breathed a new spirit into the Catholic church, and moved it into the mainstream of contemporary life. Much that had been taken for granted was ventilated, questioned, revised, or abandoned. New freedom was accorded to institutions and to individuals. The need for sharing authority, extending from the Pope himself down through the local ordinaries, was recognized. Particularly relevant to this discussion, the Council gave to the layman a new stature and status, a new importance in the Church, and an increased emphasis upon his role in it.

It was inevitable that the historic changes which came out of Vatican II would have profound effects on Catholic colleges and universities. It is not the purpose of this paper to explore those effects of the Council except to say that the Council provided a new impetus to those who had long recognized the need for reforming boards of control in church-related institutions. The Council itself provided both the precedent and the authority for such action, and the time was ripe to take it.

This, then, was the situation when newspapers began to carry front-page stories of proposed changes in the governance of several Catholic universities. Notre Dame proposed to enlarge its present board of six clerical members by the addition of six laymen, the new body to be called Fellows of the University. The fellows will delegate much of their power over University affairs to a board of trustees, but will retain control over elections to the board and removal from it, as well as over the bylaws which will govern it. Most important of all, the essential Catholic character of the University may be changed only with the approval of two-thirds of the fellows. Thus a change of this nature could not be accomplished without the concurrence of at least two members of the Congregation of the Holy Cross.

A similar result is proposed for the University of Portland, but through a somewhat different procedure. There it is proposed to set up a board of regents to be composed of five officers of the University, five clerical members of the present board, and up to thirty other elected members. Complete control of the University would then be given by a trust agreement to the board of regents, subject to reversion to the Congregation of the Holy Cross if at any time there should cease to be an integral academic and pastoral program of Catholic thought and culture. What Portland and Notre Dame are doing is to give their respective boards of control a role which is similar in most respects to that of the board of an independent, secular institution. The most significant difference lies in the reservation of control over the basic Catholic character of the institutions.

Seton Hall University, which is conducted by diocesan priests, was founded in 1961 by a board on which a majority of the trustees were laymen, and for some years has been governed by a board on which laymen, some of whom are not Catholic, outnumber clerics twelve to seven.

Th[redacted] Louis University, now controlled by a board of thirteen Jesuits, has announced that it will change to a board on which laymen will outnumber priests eighteen to ten. A layman will be the first chairman of the new board, which is expected to include Protestants and Jews. The University of Detroit plans a sixteen-man board, half of whom will be priests and half laymen. Loyola University in Chicago plans to elect some lay members to its board for the first time in its history. It is known that similar plans are under study at Fordham and John Carroll Universities.

It seems safe to predict that within a few years most Catholic institutions will have wide lay representation on their governing boards and that the roles of these boards will gradually become quite different from what they traditionally have been. While there will be rare exceptions, such as Webster College, which will become a secular college, these changes will not destroy the essential Catholic character of the institutions themselves. What can be expected, however, is that they will improve the effectiveness of a large segment of Catholic higher education, and that, by making their governing boards more catholic in membership, the institutions will themselves be enabled to become more Catholic in their work and influence.

The policy-making role of trustees in church-related colleges

PART
IV
CHAPTER
3

PAUL H. SHERRY

THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT RESPONSIBILITY of a trustee of a Protestant church-related college today is to ask the question of self-definition: For what purpose does this college exist? Too few have faced this question with any seriousness. Most trustees assume that this question was faced and answered at the time of the college's founding and their responsibility is that of implementing this purpose through finding the necessary personnel and funds. This is a fundamental error! The church-related college at this moment is facing an identity crisis, and if this is to be solved creatively, the college trustee needs to face it head-on.

When the majority of church-related colleges were founded in the nineteenth century, their purpose was that of preparing Christian men and women to Christianize and possibly intellectualize a nation. The founders were of the conviction that the church-related college should do two things: form Christian character and enlighten minds. Some did both well, some did one or the other well, some did neither well. But in any case the purpose was the same—that of forming enlightened Christian men and women to live in and promote a Christian culture.

The varying denominational agencies provided the largest source of support for the colleges and expected a return for their investment. This return was usually in the form of a high percentage of clergy on the board of trustees, usually a clergyman of some stature as president, a high percentage of committed Christians on the faculty, a student body composed largely of young people from the particular denomination's churches, a strong Christian atmosphere, and often denominational offices in the campus buildings. In other words, the denomination tended to see its college as one of its missionary arms, a sophisticated church school. It was the means by which the church prepared its future leadership.

I remember very well the annual excursion which our youth group made to our church college—Franklin and Marshall College. Our pastor was a graduate of the College, and he assumed that any of us who went to college would go there also; not so much because it was his alma mater, but because it was the church's college, the place where our Christian education would continue and mature. This attitude is not yet dead! My office continuously receives letters castigating us for not making United Church of Christ members more aware of our church colleges. These letters, as did the pastor of my youth, reflect a past history which is no more. For whether the writers are aware of it or not, times have changed. No longer do most church-related colleges receive a high percentage of their funds from church sources, no longer are a high percentage of the college trustees clergymen, no longer is there a high percentage of committed Christians on their faculties, no longer is the student body composed of young people from the particular denomination's churches, and no longer can it be assumed that chapel will be a compulsory ritual.

All these outward manifestations of the Christian or church-related college have changed, or are in the process of changing. And this change will be increasingly more rapid. What has not yet changed are the attitudes of those most intimately involved—administrators, trustees, churchmen—concerning the *identity* of the college and its relationship to the church. For although neither administrator nor trustee nor churchman would ever admit to any church domination of the college, whenever pushed to a definition all three tend to say that what distinguishes the church college from other educational institutions is its spiritual atmosphere, its combination of Christian piety and sound learning, its Christian emphasis, or its attempt to keep God at the heart of the learning process. This kind of definition is becoming less and less viable, and unless trustees take seriously the need for a new definition of their particular college more adequate to meet a new time, their college will become increasingly more irrelevant in the educational scene.

As a churchman, I would hope that when trustees of church-related colleges begin redefinition of their self-identity they will do so in educational categories, rather than religious categories. For unless they do so, their self-definition will lack both educational precision and religious precision. By trying to be both church and college, a college ends up being neither.

To illustrate this point, let me use the example of a liberal arts college which chooses to identify itself as a Christian college, thus defining its role in religious rather than educational terms. If the college takes this definition seriously, it is dealing, I believe, in self-contradictions. For if a school is Christian it is really a theological school, the church's school; and if it is a liberal arts college, by its very genius it operates out of not one heritage but several.

The task of a theological seminary, the church's school, is basically twofold: (1) to acquaint the student with the Christian tradition—in terms of the roots of this tradition, its history, and its interplay with the total historical scene; and (2) to help the student bring to bear the insights of the Christian tradition, past and present, on the contemporary cultural scene. The theological seminary operates very consciously out of one perspective, one tradition, and views its total environment from this perspective.

While this kind of education is legitimate for the theological seminary, it has doubtful legitimacy for the liberal arts college. It is not the task of the liberal arts college to choose one theological, philosophical perspective by which it operates. Instead, it is the task of the liberal arts college to acquaint and confront its students with varying perspectives, interpreting these perspectives as accurately and persuasively as possible, so that the student is prepared to choose from among the perspectives offered or those which commend themselves to him. Ideally, the liberal arts college is institutionalized dialogue, a dialogue out of which varying perspectives are criticized, corrected, and added to in order that more humane individuals and a more humane society may emerge.

So that my position is not misunderstood, let me add that I believe a liberal arts college can remain closely related to the Christian church and still be a liberal arts college. Indeed, I would argue that in many instances such a relationship would enhance its quality as a liberal arts college. However, it is one thing for a liberal arts college to be related to, or even in some instances sponsored by, a Christian church, and quite another thing to find its identity by means of the term Christian college.

Many historically church-related colleges have recognized this difficulty, I believe, and thus an increasing number choose to call themselves church-related rather than Christian colleges. But before a person or an institution chooses to relate to someone or something, he has to have some idea who he is, what his life goal will be. It is at this point that I feel that trustees of too many church-related colleges have been remiss. They have relied on watered-down versions of outmoded self-definitions rather than seeking a sharp redefinition to fit a new time. The tendency has been to view church relationship as self-definition, rather than seeing church relationship as following or not following upon a prior self-identity. Once the church-related college seriously begins to define itself in educational rather than religious categories, this will cease. Educational self-definitions will come forth which will dictate relationships to societal institutions most helpful in reaching fulfillment.

I would think, for example, that any liberal arts college which defined itself along the lines which I sketched would seek a relationship with the business community. For if such a college was to fulfill its goals, it would need the financial support which the business community could provide; and for its educational process to remain relevant it would need to be aware of the society's economic structures, as reflected in the business community. It would seek a relationship with government, again in order to secure necessary funds, but also so that its educational process might remain cognizant of a society's political life. And it would seek a relationship with the Christian church, again in order to secure necessary funds (you will notice I placed this source last), but also so that its educational process might remain conversant with a society's organized religious life. In each case the relationship is pragmatic and functional—in order to survive and in order to further its education process.

Obviously, a college which has had a close relationship to the church since its founding will want to take its history seriously. There are historical factors which will have to be taken into serious account when redefinition is pursued; and if in redefinition the college thinks in educational categories and not religious categories, the historic church relationship can be a help rather than a hindrance. The fact that the church is at this very moment in the midst of radical redefinition of its role in society is quite opportune. For if both the church and the college take this responsibility seriously enough, out of mutual self-redefinition a more creative relationship might well emerge. Among the church-related colleges which I am most familiar with, at least three are at this very moment either involved in redefinition, with particular reference to their church-relationship, or are in differing stages of preparation. These three are Beloit College, Wisconsin, which has had a committee at work for at least two years; Elmhurst College, Illinois; and Illinois College. Hopefully, many more will follow.

Let me relate a particular church-college relationship which I believe might well serve as a model for some others. It is a relationship based on a prior self-definition by both parties to it. (The fact that the college involved is a new school made for fewer complications than would ordinarily be the case.) Both entered into the relationship on the basis of mutual self-identity. The United Church of Christ sought a relationship with New College, Sarasota, Florida; and New College sought a relationship with the United Church because both decided that such a relationship would serve to further stated goals.

New College is not a Christian college; it defines itself in educational categories, not religious categories. It has no required religious program, although it does take religious studies seriously; at the moment it has no chaplain; it does not have a set number of clergymen on its board of trustees. In short, it has none of the trappings ordinarily associated with a church-related college.

The following few statements taken from its catalogue give the thrust of the college's self-definition:

> From the first day on campus, a New College student finds he is an individual. His progress both in studies and in extracurricular life becomes his own responsibility. Faculty and staff will counsel as colleagues, but only the student can dictate what his rate of progress will be. Maximum flexibility in scheduling is provided as a means to aid progress. The student may search as deeply as he chooses, going far beyond class expectations, and he will soon recognize the profit of such activity. The ideal learning situation may possibly be one faculty member conversing with one student, yet other learning situations have their special dimensions. In the lecture, the student sees the formal presentation of a subject or area. The seminar provides the opportunity to discuss a subject thoroughly and to witness the social interaction of a group. In the tutorial, there is the more directive dialogue, usually to a more specific point. All three methods are used at New College, often in a planned sequence to advance the scholarly enterprise.

> In all aspects of his college life, a student is viewed as a responsible person. There is a planned absence of directives in his New College life. The student is not made to perform routinely, but is asked to act responsibly and to try to think non-routinely. The irresponsible meet the same kinds of pressures and penalties which they will find at later stages of their lives. New College omits credits and grades from its assessment of students. Mastery of a subject is regarded as the goal for a student. . . . Faculty members are more advanced in their work than the students and it is instructive for students to know where their teachers have gone and what they have seen. But the student is just as actively and directly engaged in the search for truth as the teacher. Each is there to help the other in a way appropriate to his position. . . . At the end as well as the outset, New College education is fitted to the individual and its direction in his responsibility.

We of the United Church believe that this philosophy of education is desperately needed today, and on this basis relate to and support the New College program. One might say that its educational goals are consonant with our religious goals—the development of more humane individuals and a more humane society.

Obviously, each college will define itself in a manner peculiar to that particular institution. Each will have to take into account a particular history, particular heritage, particular resources. But for the church-related college the time for redefinition in educational categories is now!

Faculty recruitment and orientation in four-year colleges and universities

PART
IV
CHAPTER
4

FREDERIC W. NESS

EVERY SEVERAL YEARS—and it happened as recently as the American Council on Education meeting last October—some leading authority assures us either that there is no faculty shortage or that what little shortage there may be has only the most emphemeral significance.

Because of the striking variance between Allen Cartter's optimistic outlook and my own vastly more bearish experience, and particularly because lately I have had a somewhat less intimate association with recruitment than was true in days of yore, I recently sent out that most despicable of all devices, the questionnaire. This particular one represented in no way a scientific sampling, for I limited the fortunate recipients to approximately sixty-five college presidents whom I considered my friends (note the past tense) and whom I could call by first name. Their responses suggest, among other things, that I may have to revise my Christmas card list before another season rolls around.

To my question, "What changes, if any, have you experienced in the recruitment of faculty over the past five years?" the unanimous response from my former friends was the astonishing observation that recruitment has become much more difficult. As with so many things in academia, the calendar seems always to be moving backward. Whereas formerly recruitment began in December, now it seems to be starting in dead earnest in November, if not earlier. And despite the vast improvements in the mail service and in electronic communication, there seem to be much greater delays now in getting answers. Because of both of these factors, faculty recruitment, according to my sample, is becoming more expensive and more highly specialized.

Another big difference reportedly is in what the neophyte can demand and get. He seems to be increasingly concerned about material benefits—salaries, office space, research facilities, parking, and so forth—and decreasingly concerned about the fine art of learning. In fact, he is acting more like a prospective quarterback each year. Also, his demands are more specific.

My respondents from the liberal arts colleges confessed to a steady decline in the number of Ph.D.'s whom they are able to attract. We have known for some time through Ray Maul's statistics that this was happening, but I for one have never permitted myself to be easily frightened by statistics, let alone mere facts and trends. One of the letters contained the startling observation that "colleges which cannot attract for academic reasons resort to salaries." That, you will admit, is a sign of stark desperation. On the brighter side, some colleges seem to have experienced a degree of success with attracting teachers who are seeking a respite from the publish-or-perish syndrome.

Since I do not believe we should look backward in our profession, the second item in my questionnaire was concerned with trends in faculty recruitment to be expected over the next five years. It should surprise no one, except possibly Mr. Cartter, when I report that the outlook appears rather bleak. My friends offer these pleasant predictions: First, recruitment, which has traditionally enjoyed certain seasonal limitations, affording the recruiters time to lick their wounds, may well become a year-round activity. Second, salaries will continue to go up. As with the Loch Ness monster, there seems to be no end in sight. And third, the availability of Ph.D.'s for the classroom, despite vastly increasing enrollment in graduate schools, will continue to plummet. (There seems to be little enthusiasm for the alternate teaching degrees. Despite the M.Phil., M.P., Ph.M., D.A., and the like, a good old Ph.D. still seems to be the passport to Parnassus.)

Turning from this joyous prognostication, I should like to share a few of the replies I received to the question, "Do you have any suggestions which might improve faculty recruitment either nationally or for your particular type of institution?" The first response I opened was quite revealing of the candor which exists between college administrators. In typical pedagogic fashion, it returned question for question: "Does Gimbels tell Macy's?"

A number of the responses did reflect the lingering hope that if one were only able to elevate the status of his own institution, recruitment possibilities would become brighter; but this hope was inevitably tempered by acknowledgment of the inherent regression: that is, one can't really improve the institution until he can attract better faculty. This is known as the classical squirrel cage.

Some of the specific observations include the following: (1) One should not overlook the possibility of tapping a strong department in a lesser institution. (2) Part of our present problem allegedly derives from our failure to perform a paramount duty: that is, to accord the proper importance to undergraduate teaching and aggressively lure the good Ph.D. candidates into the vocation. There are, it is said, still a few graduate students not hopelessly infected by the virus of research. (3) And several correspondents brought up again that cherished dream of many of us for a national placement bureau which could employ modern electronic techniques to match candidates and openings.

Frankly, the questions on faculty orientation did not yield answers that can be fruitfully categorized or that require extensive comment. But I might observe that: (1) Most of the respondents recognize the need for some sort of orientation, although a few are contemptuous of the implication that it called for any sort of formal program. (2) Most institutions seem to leave orientation strictly to the departmental chairmen, which, I suggest, is a rather clear indication of the value placed upon it by the central administration. (3) Those institutions which appear to be most negative about formal orientation programs are also ones that expressed greatest discouragement about the recruitment outlook for the next five years (I shall let you judge for yourselves whether there is a correlation here).

With this, I shall redirect attention to recruitment. I shall, of course, be rather eclectic.

First, a semantic issue: as far as recruitment is concerned, I am not at all sanguine about the possibility of an intermediate degree's being accepted as good currency in the academic marketplace, despite the fact that a few of our major institutions—the ones that traditionally set styles—are now making motions in that direction. I am sure that we shall continue to experience the perennial shortage of Ph.D.'s and that we shall have no choice but to fill the ranks with non-Ph.D's. You may have read Frank Bowles's statement to the effect that, whereas "we are now founding colleges at the rate of twenty or more a year . . . , I believe that within ten years we will be founding them at the rate of one a week." It would seem obvious, even if this prediction is overly dramatic, that we will never have the number of Ph.D.'s we will need to fill our classrooms if we continue along in our present same happy, carefree manner. We will not solve the problem by semantics. We will have to solve it by a vastly more creative approach to the whole problem of teaching and learning than has yet been evident. If anything, I would suggest that the title of Doctor of Philosophy be reserved for the college teacher, with a new designation concocted for the individual who proposes to spend his life in research or nonacademic service.

But this, I insist, is only semantics. I can remember having to crank the box on the wall in order to awaken the telephone operator—and incidentally alert the other families on the party line so that they could listen in on my conversations with my childhood sweetheart. Recently, in the Mojave Desert, I visited the hydrogen bomb-proof installation of the most advanced telecommunication center in the world. My point is obvious. The telephone company has developed methods to meet the demands of a highly sophisticated and expanding society. Higher education has not made a comparable effort, and the mere manipulation of degrees seems almost childishly irrelevant.

Second, there is a possibility of improving our recruitment prospects through a nationwide placement service. If such a national program is necessary, and I believe it is, I suggest that our half dozen leading educational associations—both those that represent institutional interests and those that combine general faculty interests—get together, decide on the kind of agency needed, and make a vigorous effort to secure necessary funding. I doubt that such an agency would be particularly effective in recruiting greater numbers of more highly qualified individuals into the profession; but if it could provide a means of better matching the individual with the institution, it might conceivably reduce the frustration level, and thus in the long run make the academic a more alluring way of life. At the very least, such a nationwide program could effect fiscal savings through reducing some of the busy work of recruitment, which in turn would permit the recruiters more time for their own intellectual endeavors. Since the recruiter is not infrequently the college president himself, I am deeply moved by any suggestion which could at the same time save money and encourage me to indulge occasionally in intellectual endeavor.

Third, a broader view of orientation might conceivably have some impact upon recruitment. I have long felt that if some serious effort were made to provide orientation to the progression of college teaching early enough, more of our highly qualified doctoral candidates would be saved for the classroom. It interested me to notice recently that between the first and third editions of *Guide to Graduate Study,* in which the graduate schools were invited to indicate what programs they maintain, if any, to orient the doctoral candidate toward careers in teaching, there has been little perceptible development since 1957—despite the fact that doctoral programs have increased by almost one third in this decade. By and large, the graduate schools are simply not interested.

Certain aspects of orientation are possible only on the scene. I refer to such matters as parking fees, health insurance forms, and policies which govern whether or not the instructor's bride may pick up his monthly paycheck in the business office without a notarized permission slip. But vastly more important is the orientation which attempts to acquaint the new professor with the nature and purpose of the institution, its aspirations, structure, personality, emphasis, and his particular role in the philosophical scheme of things. In some parts of the country the new faculty member is deluged with communications from the faculty unions many months before he sets foot on the campus. And while I would be the last to say that this is not orientation of a sort, I am naturally skeptical of some of its value.

I feel very strongly that orientation to college teaching should be included as a valid part of doctoral study, and that the second stage of the prospective faculty member's orientation should come during the recruitment interview. Our sales job much too often imitates the pitch of the industrial recruiter, with emphasis upon salary, workload, fringe benefits, and the like, instead of a candid discussion of the institution's objectives and attitudes. The result is too often a mismating which produces tensions and often leads to painful divorce.

And if you think things are bad now, just wait!

The good place or no place: communication on the campus

PART IV CHAPTER 5

ROBERT S. FOGARTY

THERE IS A PASSAGE in A. A. Milne's *The House at Pooh Corner* that has always been one of my favorites. It is a section of dialogue between Rabbit and Pooh and it goes like this: " 'I don't see much sense in that,' said Rabbit. 'No;' said Pooh, humbly, 'there isn't. But there was going to be when I began it. It's just that something happened to it on the way.' "

I think that you may substitute the words faculty, student, and administrator for Rabbit and Pooh (in any order or sequence) and come up with a pretty fair statement of the problem of communication on the campus. What I would like to focus on is the "something" that happened and the "it" that appears to be senseless—namely, the modern university.

Lewis Mumford, in his preface to *The Story of Utopias* (1922), said that utopia was the opposite of one-sidedness, partisanshipness, partiality, provinciality, specialism, and that "He who practiced the utopian method must view life synoptically and see it as an interrelated whole: not as a random mixture but as an organic and increasingly organizable union of parts whose balance it was important to maintain—as in any organism—in order to promote growth and transcendence."

David Riesman, writing in 1948, gave another definition of utopia which I shall use as the basis of my discussion. After suggesting that a revival of utopian thinking was one of the important intellectual tasks of the day, Mr. Riesman gave the following definition: "A utopia I define as a rational belief which is in the long-run interest of the holder; it is a belief, not in existing reality, but in a potential reality; it must not violate what we know of nature, including human nature, though it may extrapolate our present technology and must transcend our present social organization."

Writing some forty-five years after Mr. Mumford and almost twenty years after Mr. Riesman, Daniel Bell noted that the modern university increasingly was committed to a decidedly anti-utopian course in its devotion to narrow professionalism, early specialization, and service obligations to state and nation. However, he also noted that this technocratic orientation was being countered by a strong tendency among some students toward the apocalyptic mode of thinking, whether in nihilistic or romantic terms.

What I would like to suggest is that the problem of communication on the campus can be viewed in terms of an argument over what constitutes utopia, or the university, and whether or not, as Thomas More noted in his introduction to *Utopia* (1516), the word could mean the "good place" or "no place."

In order to clarify this distinction I shall give my own estimate of the utopian projections of faculty, students, and administrators in order to explain how a communication breakdown can occur on a complex campus.

Students: Taking Mr. Bell's two groups, the technocrats and the apocalypts, we find that the modern university generally serves well the aspirations of only one of the two: the young technocrat. Whether he be a youthful Edward Teller or Hugh Hefner, the university feeds him well, provides good recreational and research facilities, and in general cares for most of his needs because one of the service functions of the modern university is to give the society what it wants: e.g., more scientists and playboys.

However, the young apocalypt's vision of the university as a good place of imagination, ideas, transcendence, and exploratory growth is not so well served. This youthful St. John is willing to forego the new dorms, snack grills, and fraternities for stimulating professors, small classes, the Peace Corps, freedom, justice, and equality—in short, all those things hinted at in the college catalogue.

And, given the nature of the multiversity, such exotic things are rarely found because of the needs, pressures, and inclinations of the faculty and administration. Therefore the new mutants, as Leslie Fiedler calls them, turn not to the university for growth and transcendence, but to a private world which provides what the university does not.

Faculty: There are no convenient faculty categories, and to try to project what any faculty wants would not be utopian but clairvoyant. However, it is possible to suggest that for a great many faculty members the utopian university would give them a combination of the Harvard library, Berkeley students, and the rights and privileges of a Cambridge don. And I might throw in McSorley's Wonderful Saloon as the faculty club (no wives or administrative staff), with its excellent motto on the door: "Good Ale, Raw Onions, and No Ladies."

This good place has room in it for a few students (good students, that is) and administrators (lackeys, that is), but not much more. When this idyllic projection is threatened, for example by bigger classes, the knowledge explosion, publish or perish, administrative duties, then we have a dystopia of student unrest, hurried research, and committee work.

Administration: Here we find a different vision and one much closer to St. Paul than to St. John, but still equally real in the mind of the beholder. The good place is composed of serious students, pleasant faculty, and a competent staff. It is a place where one has buildings designed by Yamasaki rather than the state architect, funds generally available but never specifically earmarked, and an academic program that serves the ends of God and society. Can such a place exist, particularly in a large university, with the problems attendant to servicing and placating faculty and students and, at the same time, legislators, trustees, labor unions, and staff personnel whose orientation is toward a job rather than the educational process?

Is communication possible, given these different utopian ideals, or should higher education simply accept the assumption that the war of the worlds will continue and that at best all the universities can hope for is that random mixture Mr. Mumford spoke of? I have a few modest proposals and a few utopian reminders that I hope might aid students, faculty, and administrators in communicating and realizing utopia rather than dystopia.

First, I propose that all three groups stop lying to one another and the general public. Administrators should cease the publication of slick magazines which simplemindedly present the university as a paragon of virtue, justice, and learning—in short, they should tell the students and alumni an occasional truth even if it tarnishes the university's image in the public mind.

Examples of such lying are known to all of us, but I shall give one example in order to remind you of the nature of the disservice that a university can perform not only to its members but to its own best intentions. The following is taken from a progress report of a large state university and tends to reinforce a public notion that the university is both a trade and a finishing school:

> Student protests and demonstrations make news, no matter what the motivation and the circumstances, so the general public must have been given cause to believe on occasion last year that universities were seething centers of discontent. ——— received its share of dubious publicity and we can only hope that most people realized what was pointed out too often: only a minute fraction of the student population was involved, and that fraction over and over again. The overwhelming majority of our students went about their business choosing to assert their opinions and their suggestions in a more mannerly, and if it must be pointed out, more effective way.

What disturbs me about such a statement is not so much the readily seen half-truths, but the conscious half-lies which assume that the channels of communication are, in fact, open. Of course they are open, but only to the "mannerly" and those who do not get "involved" too often. It is all reminiscent of the story told about the young mother who, after being complimented about her beautiful baby, responded: "Oh, that's nothing, you should see his photograph!"

It is not my intention to castigate the administrators and leave the faculty and students with their self-image intact, since the lying is evident on all fronts. For example, many faculty members profess an interest in education, yet do not have time to talk to students; many claim to be intellectuals, yet rarely read beyond their own areas of specialization; many teach the latest research techniques, but fail to do any original research on their own. Again, there is nothing new or startling here as we see the familiar pattern of professional self-deception that protects the faculty from the students and administration.

Finally, and here the word *lying* may be too strong, will the students admit that they find the university a good place to be simply because they have no place to go? That the social and sexual limbo they find themselves in may be difficult but certainly not impossible, and that their demands for a relevant curriculum impose upon them an obligation to find out what was relevant in the past?

Second, the communication process, particularly on a large campus, must look beyond the traditional modes of campus expression—student newspapers and government—to that subterranean world that attracts the disaffiliated and uncommitted. Those students who have turned their backs on the university in search of utopia in groves other than academe do not and will not turn to the counseling center for aid. And rightly so, since the center is often an arm of the dean of students' office, and the counselors, sometimes in good faith, parrot the "adjustment" line which is exactly what the student expected to hear. How many universities would be willing to set up autonomous counseling clinics responsible only to the director and not the university?

We should remind ourselves, as Kenneth Keniston does in *The Uncommitted,* that the absence of articulate expression does not demonstrate the absence of feeling, passion, and belief, and that the fact that students cannot fully articulate their needs and aspirations does not mean that they may not rebel against the discrepancy between what is and what they dimly, almost unconsciously, sense might be.

What we have seen recently in terms of student unrest might, paradoxically, be viewed not as a communication breakdown but as an all too perceptive reading of the messages that pour forth from the universities. Although the rebellious students may not have read Marshall McLuhan, they understand that the medium is the message after only a short stay on many of our campuses. Or as Rebecca West put it in *Black Lamb and Gray Falcon* when she described the mental state of a revolutionary assassin of the late nineteenth century: "Many people are unable to say what they mean only because they have not been given an adequate vocabulary by their environment; and their apparently meaningless remarks may be inspired by a sane consciousness of real facts." Therefore, when students demand something better than this they are often not able to define that "something" because they have never come in contact with the real university of their dreams.

Third, I propose that the faculty must decide whether it will perform a clerical or a critical function, and by so deciding recognize that the answer will determine the nature of its professional life style. It must choose between allegiance to institution and job, or profession and discipline. If they choose to be clerics, then they are bound to obey and transmit the creed of the church. If, however, they choose to be critics, then they must expect to find themselves occasionally excommunicated. One of the problems in communication at present is that the life style of most teachers is deplorable. Both students and administration view the faculty as mere functionaries who willingly carry out tasks assigned to them. This functionary role is both passive and predictable, since few teachers have any sense of their own moral or educational power.

Faculty members are content to be personnel; and what we call aloofness is, in reality, an academic justification for a clerical job. The failure of the academic community to convey its ideas, aspirations, and goals to our best students is the result of a lack of the critical style and the pervasiveness of the clerical role. Institutions may have a style, but clerics may not. Critics do have a style because it is they and their ideas that count, not their job.

Fourth, I think that the university should stop serving the ends of the state and begin to serve its own ends which, if we keep Mr. Mumford and Mr. Riesman in mind, are essentially utopian. Since it is the function of a university to preserve, enhance, and comment on the quality of past and present life, it should bear in mind the remarks of Karl Mannheim in his *Ideology and Utopia:* "It is the utopian element—i.e., the nature of the dominant wish—which determines the sequence, order, and evaluation of single experiences." If it is the dominant wish of the modern university to deal with our fondest utopian ideals, then communication is possible; if, however, it chooses to deal in goods and services, then the communication breakdown we have seen in the last few years will continue. We will have more utopias of student, faculty, and administration "escape" than utopias of "reconstruction." Instead of the good place we shall have no place.

Increasingly one hears both students and faculty discuss the contemporary scene in terms of escape rather than reconstruction simply because they feel that the modern university is neither organizable nor balanced, but a Tower of Babel. Students feel caught in Skinner boxes, faculty in Kurt Vonnegut's player piano dancing mechanically to irrelevant old tunes, and administrators in a brave new world of instant morality and soma drugs. Each, as I indicated earlier, has a utopian ideal, but each is imprisoned in a dystopia.

Finally—and here I am paraphrasing Henry Aiken—is it possible for the university to render a service to its own community—students, faculty, and administrators alike—by being an example of a community of mutually developing persons at once learned and cultivated, dedicated to their own work, but responsible to achievements of orders different from their own? Or will we all, because of the inability of the university to provide a good place for us, prefer the epigram that is found at the beginning of Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*: "If they give you ruled paper, write the other way"?

Frisky horses and frisky trustees

ROBERT MENKE

PART
IV
CHAPTER
6

READING ABOUT WHAT TRUSTEES DO can be dull business. Trying to be a good one is a horse of a different color. Henry Wriston has something to say about horses and trustees in his book, *Academic Procession.* He says, "Managing to live with a board of trustees is like riding a spirited horse that is very skittish. Trustees will shy at a shadow rather more quickly than at real danger. Nonetheless, people like to ride spirited horses and after one has learned the art, it is a thrilling experience and never boring." The trouble, perhaps, is that trustees are still noble beasts who have raced to win and are not ready to be put to pasture or paraded in a paddock. They are still feeling their oats. We should either have fat nags as trustees or let 'em run. Henry evidently gave his trustees a loose rein as long as they knew who was in the driver's seat.

Someone has to decide what kind of race we're in. Most trustees today are entered in a handicap or a futurity. The syndicalists don't want them on the track. The "give, get, or get out" school doesn't care how they run so long as their weights are solid gold and silver. There are touts in every administration who like spirited horses, but slightly spavined so that they don't run so hard that they upset the dope sheet. Less than a hundred years ago, trustees were preachers who examined each degree candidate in order to insure a literate ministry. This was the heyday of the township trustee and the one-room schoolhouse. Like much of our apparatus of government, our college boards of governance have not adapted themselves to the conditions which resulted from the quite recent change from horses to jet airplanes. We're in a Pegasus derby in higher education today. Henry's spirited horses must sprout wings and fly.

Most regents or trustees are dedicated to the advancement of education generally and to the particular institution which they serve. They are too busy in their private lives to undertake a complete new dedication. They take their duties and their positions of status in the institution seriously—the status particularly. They approve the choice of a president. They sigh over the budget and faculty appointments, plan for physical expansion and the investment of funds (if any). Theirs is a judicial function with little time to discuss the problems of education. Except for some *ad hoc* social functions, this is about the extent of their performance unless the school is in trouble financially or in its relation to an amorphous public. Most schools today have image or money troubles, so that the role of trustee has become more crucial. The fact that it is a crucial role means that it is time for us to give some thought to their selection, the extent of their responsibilities, and their induction or orientation. We should try to understand these problems and concomitant responsibilities better so that we can decide whether trustees should sink or swim, as in the past, or whether a more sophisticated welcome to their job is in order.

Among the problems in education today which make good trustees handy to have around are certain shortcomings endemic to various support agencies, especially state governors and legislatures. As Chancellor Wells of Indiana University once said, "Legislators are dedicated public servants, but as statesmen, of course, they like the role of founding fathers, so unfortunately they would rather found an institution than pay for its upkeep." Multiversities are shadow governments whose operations reach into every corner of society. Even the community impact of a small college can be global because there is no monopoly on research, ideas, or public service. Institutions of higher learning are the most dynamic organizations in the world because they are in ferment intellectually, because they are rightfully committed to social improvement, and because they challenge hierarchies of thought and structure. They are dynamic because they are pluralistic and encourage academic freedom and initiative, and therefore solid accomplishment. But because of this social thrust and controversy, these institutions need to be interpreted and reinterpreted to legislators, alumni, denominations, and other support groups. This function requires a charisma not often found in public relations staffs.

Ordway Tead, in his book, *Trustees, Teachers, Students,* quotes Thomas Arnold of Rugby fame as saying: "No one has the right to meddle with the university who does not know them well and love them." Collegiums have become so complex and oftentimes impersonal that it is difficult for the busy student or peripatetic professor to know them well, let alone love them. It is the responsibility of the trustee to help humanize institutions of higher learning in order to preserve the best of our folk society in the supersociety, to foster an understanding and respect for leadership in all its manifestations and an acceptance of the shared values or moral commitments that John W. Gardner mentions in his *The Antileadership Vaccine.* A trustee must be familiar with the history and traditions of his school and possess a singular determination to make his school distinguished in the rating of its faculty and curricula. If students are adequately housed, if there are open spaces, if there is action in the arts, in athletics, and on the social front combined with academic excellence, then students will not need a soapbox or an ombudsman.

I can't help referring to Indiana University because she is my favorite school. She is ninth in size in the nation and in the top twenty-five in the world; and yet the attitudes of her undergraduates are conservative and perhaps more moral than some of the small, church-related liberal arts schools of Indiana. She has, if anything, a much smaller percentage of clowns and good-time Charlies than when I was in school twenty-five years ago. The difference is that today there are reporters from the city paper living on the campus who, in good faith, provide factual material for the writers of lurid headlines for prurient adults who wish to have their opinions confirmed regarding degenerate youth on the big, unreconstructed, atheistic American campus. This is all hogwash, of course. Practically all the kids are in their rooms studying. There are those who are genuinely alienated today with an obsessive outreach who need special tender loving care. For the frustrated, for the alienated, for the clowns and good-time Charlies, for all students and faculty, we must ask ourselves: What are we doing to make our schools more lovable?

Although there are some 2,000 colleges and universities in our country today, 10 percent are oversold in the lively competition for the half of all high school graduates that seek higher education. Whose job is it to discover ways of encouraging cooperation between schools—particularly between the haves and have-nots, the large and the small? We have an Indiana conference on higher education where the sagamores go to learn and to bury the hatchet. But the hatchets don't always stay buried, and it is often the officials of the smaller colleges who hack away at the big institutions when they should be using their energy and imagination to chip away at their own problems. The small schools have their associations and the large schools their consortia, but what is needed is some kind of forced and continuous dialogue. Trustees could help by meeting with other trustees to exchange ideas and evaluate resources and programs.

Indiana University currently has a proposal before the legislature which would establish a system of closed-circuit television to connect major campuses, cities, and small colleges in a kind of computerized holding of hands. Perhaps this mechanical interdigitation can penetrate the ivy walls to capture the teaching talent, the culture, the library facilities, and the entertainment that is scattered throughout the state hiding under so many bushel baskets. Revolutionary programs of education in small colleges can change accreditation requirements which will permit the pooling of money and the development of new population centers. This decentralization could ease the crisis of growth in metropolitan areas. It is interesting to know that a shortage of doctors was the impetus for this suggested microwave network. Indiana University is training enough doctors, but approximately 57 percent of them settle out of state, where they do their intern and residency work. By cooperating through television linkage with small centers of training in major hospitals, Indiana can not only attract interns but retrain doctors as well.

Trustees must take an interest in defining the purposes of colleges and universities, particularly in respect to their public service activities. Sheer size, growth, specialization of knowledge, and the natural need for personal as well as academic shelter from an importunate macroworld tend to fragment our college faculties. There is often more loyalty and communication between the same disciplines on different campuses than there is cooperation between schools in a particular institution. Academic freedom can be twisted to mean freedom from institutional goals. Diffuse authority poses many special problems in integrating large numbers who share responsibility for decision-making. At each level of the organization some leadership is necessary. Indiana University is staging an exciting interdisciplinary public-oriented program this semester called "FOCUS: The City," in which every pertinent available resource within and without the campus has been invited to throw light on the problems of urban blight. There is nothing new about this method except that the tools have been sharpened, the facts are updated, and the involvement is more extensive. We fail in not having more cooperative projects with a broader student participation. Have we taken an inventory lately of public service projects and special studies in our schools so that everyone understands what's going on? Does the public know about it? Do the trustees know?

Education is a dangerous business today because while it challenges conformity and injustice, it often appears to challenge sacred traditions and the accented values of the community. Education is a vulnerable business because it gives the appearance of affluence in a society that is not so affluent in terms of its needs and expectations. Education is a critical business today because the tide of change cannot be stopped and democratic means must be found to implement solutions to the pressing problems of our society. Trustees are at the interface between the public and our colleges; they speak to both communities.

There is a frontier ethos of brawn which still regards education as a bit unmanly. There are those who think colleges should be reduced to army barracks. There are those who think that colleges should simply teach and do not see their relationship to research and service operations. There are those with a grudge against one school who would destroy them all. There are those with a nostalgia for Old Siwash. Indiana University's limestone buildings are largely financed through bond issues, while the percentage of state support has declined from 54 to 39 percent of the total budget within the last decade. The Indiana Constitution mandates free education; but without fees, foundations, and federal help, the University could not operate. Most schools give an appearance of prosperity today because of the wealth of some of the students, the service functions, the athletic plants, and the general outside appearance. Inside, parsimony reigns.

In Indiana, the legislature asks Indiana University for two budgets—one based on additional enrollment and inflationary costs, the other on an extensive survey of departmental needs. The program budget is some $30 million higher, although, aside from its pinpointing of new areas of priority in the various schools, its only ostensible function in the legislature is that of protecting the base budget. Now, with more concerted attacks on state-supported institutions of higher learning, what we need is a programed program budget to rescue the program budget which will in turn rescue the cost budget from the nit-pickers, the anti-intellectuals, and the sincere but misinformed practitioners of thrift.

A person should have demonstrated a lifelong interest in education to be a good college overseer. Like all leaders, he must be familiar with restraint and failure. The trustee's wife or husband should like being the spouse of a trustee. The trustee must be a fast reader and be able to think clearly in a roomful of cigar smoke. He should be 95 percent trained before the event. Moreover, he should have the temerity to inquire as to why there has been no systematic effort made to inculcate, brainwash, or otherwise close the balance of his personal knowledge gap. W. H. Cowley of Stanford University once stated: "The problems of how to select and how to educate trustees concerning education and research have not yet been squarely met." According to Paul H. Davis, consultant in institutional finance and public relations and university trustee, "Most boards are a serious problem and few even approach the full potential of their authority and responsibility." To quote C. W. deKiewiet, former president of the University of Rochester, "A board of trustees is the single most important agency a university has to state its case and influence opinion." John Millett, of the Ohio Board of Regents, has said, "The Board of Trustees provides a collective expression of value judgments drawn from beyond the academic community itself." John J. Corson, professor of public and international affairs at Princeton University, strengthens the role of the university trustee by saying, "Few men in history have ever had such great responsibility and such great opportunity as have college trustees."

There are all kinds of ways to educate board members—seminars or retreats, books and reports, educational themes for meetings, visitations with other schools, attendance at national meetings, special gatherings with students and faculty, committee organization of boards, and so forth. Perhaps some day, as leisure increases or with early retirement, trustees will be able to give full time to their jobs. No longer will they be anonymous factors in education, nor will they have to put their names on bronze plaques at the entrances of new buildings to be remembered. Hopefully, there may be fewer legislators and larger governing boards so that there can be more long-range planning in the areas that really count and less jawbone politics. Boards will be diverse in their membership, partaking of qualities other than those predominantly male, Caucasian, and lawyerish. These new regents will have the physical charm of a Greek athlete, the cunning of a Machiavelli, the wisdom of a Solomon, the courage of a lion, the stomach of a goat, but, most endearing of all, may they always have, as Mr. Wriston suggests, the spirit of a frisky horse.

Church-related colleges: where next?

MANNING M. PATTILLO

PART IV CHAPTER 7

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES affiliated with religious bodies are sponsored by sixty-four different communions; they are located in forty-eight of the fifty states but are concentrated in the eastern half of the country; and they enroll about one-sixth of all college students. They are growing, but not as rapidly as American higher education as a whole. They draw their students primarily from the middle social and economic class. Although, in the aggregate, they offer a wide range of graduate and professional programs, the typical church-affiliated institution is an undergraduate college emphasizing the functions of liberal, preprofessional, and teacher education.

This segment of education includes some of the best colleges in the United States, and many of the poorest. About fifty could be described as institutions of high quality, while at the other end of the spectrum 167, at last reckoning, were unaccredited by their regional agencies.

We hear and read a great deal these days about the financial plight of private higher education, and especially of the small college. In the last year or so there has also been a rash of publicity about the problems of freedom and organization in church institutions, with particular attention to Roman Catholic colleges and universities. Much of this has been superficial journalistic treatment occasioned by a few spectacular incidents. They are but manifestations of deeper, underlying problems: the crisis in the churches, the crisis in liberal education, and the crisis in administrative leadership.

We live in an age when the church has lost much of its authority. Both clergy and laity experience increasing uncertainty as to the essential content of the Christian faith and as to the role of the church. Although church membership figures are high, the requirements of membership are usually nominal, and the influence of the churches on their members often difficult to discern. In general, the churches do not speak with a strong and united voice. On almost any issue—theological, moral, social—churchmen will be found arguing, in the name of religion, on both sides.

The scholarly literature in the field of religion reflects much the same uncertainty. Schools of thought and their leaders come and go rapidly. The ministry as a profession is characterized by anxiety and by what James M. Gustafson of the Yale Divinity School has called normlessness. The minister has to cope with the fact that, as Mr. Gustafson puts it, "in the secularization of modern life God is very remote to most men. Indeed, it is difficult to be a clergyman in an age in which the death of God is one of the basic principles of life."

It is a time of iconoclastic criticism. Theological professors criticize ecclesiastical officialdom; clergy criticizes laity; laity criticizes clergy; and everyone criticizes the seminaries. Almost every aspect of church life is being scrutinized and found wanting. Many of the pleas for reform have a highly moralistic and utopian flavor. Constructive action lags far behind the reformist ferment, and one wonders whether we shall not soon enter a period of disillusionment. Most of the churches seem to lack comprehensive plans of action to achieve long-range objectives.

All of this results in an unstable situation for the church-sponsored colleges. In the eyes of some churchmen the colleges appear unexciting and even anachronistic. Their curricula are supposed to be undergirded and integrated by religion, but religion itself is in dispute in the churches. Moreover, college budgets have grown so much more rapidly than church budgets that the church-sponsored colleges cannot expect that church support will keep pace with their needs. When this fact is realized, some college administrators and faculty members conclude that the inconveniences of being church-related are greater than the rewards. Moreover, higher education, a burgeoning social institution, does not like to think of itself as an auxiliary to a social institution (the church) which is in relative decline compared with government and education.

Meanwhile, the time-honored idea of liberal education as broad preparation for civic leadership and responsible living has been undergoing erosion, too. Under the influence of the graduate schools the liberal arts college has become a kind of junior university pointing toward technical scholarship. Specialized academic competence becomes the prime objective, though a gesture is made in the direction of a sampling of the several broad fields of knowledge. The acquisition of knowledge rather than the development of the person becomes the emphasis. The college apes the university. Ironically, the *strong* college, which can compete successfully with universities in recruiting promising young scholars to its faculty, is most guilty of premature specialization and professionalization. (A few months ago the dean of one of our highly respected colleges told me proudly that seniors in mathematics at his institution were taking courses that were not available at Princeton until the second year of graduate study.) Thus, almost imperceptibly liberal arts education has tended to evolve into a kind of training which is best suited to the prospective professional scholar. Likewise, the expansion of occupational preparation in the American university, whether in engineering, business, agriculture, or whatever, has tended to push liberal education from the center of the stage.

No one wishes to disparage the achievements of technical scholarship or the value of training students for essential occupations, including college and university teaching. The public welfare requires that we have well-trained practitioners in a wide variety of professional fields. The danger is that specialized and professional interests will crowd out or distort the broader aims of liberal education. This is precisely what has happened.

The church-related institutions are predominantly liberal arts colleges.

The crisis in liberal education has damaged them by diverting them from their historic role of preparing young people for broad leadership. The world today badly needs people with vision, perspective, and wisdom—the attributes of the liberally educated man. This, not the training of technical experts, is the primary task of the liberal arts college. The liberal arts college should be pre-eminently the school for leadership.

Few of our church-sponsored colleges are discharging this responsibility with distinction. I should like to see at least one college design a program of liberal education which would provide the breadth of learning and nurture the skills and motivation necessary for public or civic leadership. At an earlier time the public schools in England, certain secondary schools in America (Groton and St. Paul's, for example), and perhaps some of our colleges performed this function; but today no institution (with the possible exception of two or three law schools) comes close to the ideal. (Incidentally, Walter Lippmann, in his *Essays in the Public Philosophy,* has given valuable clues for the development of such a program.)

It takes an extraordinary administrator to enable a church-sponsored college to deal successfully with the crises in the churches and in liberal education. He must have a sound philosophy of liberal education, must be a competent scholar, must have well-developed managerial skills, and must be a dedicated and intelligent churchman. There are precious few such men, and we do not have enough of them for our colleges. Moreover, we have not made the college presidency a tenable post for the qualified men who are available. We expect too much of presidents, and we do not make it possible for them to devote enough of their time to educational leadership. This is in part a matter of administrative organization—a subject which has been discussed at some length in the Danforth report. Suffice it to say here that we ought to experiment with new patterns of staffing in order to relieve the president of some of the unreasonable burden which he now bears. He needs a corps of experienced administrators around him, working closely as a team. Business and industry are far ahead of higher education in this respect.

The point I should like to pursue is the necessity, for the church-sponsored college, of having a president who is a dedicated and intelligent churchman. This is the most controversial of the qualifications.

If we are to have strong church-sponsored colleges in the years ahead, we must have presidents who love the church and are willing to grapple with its problems as they grapple with their own. It is not necessary that they be clergymen; indeed, I think that devout laymen may be preferable. Many presidents have a pragmatic view of the church; they look upon the church primarily as a tool to get students and money. I have already explained that the benefits of church sponsorship are becoming less than the inconveniences. But a president who really loves the church will be willing to put up with the hardships, and he will encourage the faculty to contribute to the solution of church problems. This is our best hope for vital churches and vital church-sponsored colleges.

Now, a final word of prophecy. What does the future hold for the 800 church-related colleges? Can they overcome the three crises I have described?

I believe that we shall see a flowering of Roman Catholic higher education. The Second Vatican Council released forces that should greatly strengthen Catholic colleges and universities. There is a new spirit of self-criticism and freedom in these institutions. The social and economic progress of the Roman Catholic population in recent decades will provide better students and more enlightened support for Catholic higher education. The Church has a body of theological, philosophical, and social teaching which can serve as a firm basis for educational programs. There will be more freedom of inquiry but not chaos in Roman Catholic thought. It should be possible to expand the group of quite strong Catholic institutions from ten or twelve to twenty-five or thirty.

The picture in Protestantism is more mixed. I foresee a decline in liberal Protestant higher education. Many of the colleges now classified in this group will remain strong, but their contribution to religion in education will, I believe, diminish. In such denominations as the Methodist Church, United Presbyterian Church, American Baptist Convention, United Church of Christ, and Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ), a number of institutions have tenuous church relationships and a discouragingly secular climate. The tendency in much of liberal Protestantism toward cultural accommodation makes it difficult to maintain distinctive educational institutions and undermines their *raison d'être*.

The conservative Protestant colleges associated with cohesive groups should gain strength and enhance their position in higher education. Their theological moorings will undoubtedly be affected somewhat by the prevailing secularity, but this may prove to be an academic stimulus. There is a strong drive toward self-improvement in some of these colleges, as there is in Roman Catholic higher education. The conservative Protestant denominations and colleges may also gain adherents and support from the attrition in liberal Protestantism.

The church-sponsored liberal arts colleges, as institutions organized separately from graduate schools, have an excellent opportunity to restore the purposes of liberal education and develop new programs of preparation for broad leadership in society. A few have taken advantage of this opportunity, but most cannot launch significant experimental efforts. This brings us to the problem of administrative leadership. I see no indications that the church-related colleges are taking steps to solve this problem. Most seem content to balance their budgets, improve their physical plants, and tread the well-worn paths of academic imitation, leaving administrative and curricular experimentation to others.

The opportunity for educational invention remains, however, and let us hope that some will seize it and the fifteen-century-long tradition of Christian collegiate education will be revitalized.

PART
IV
CHAPTER
8

Where next: the future of Catholic higher education

CHARLES E. FORD

SIXTY CHURCHES ARE, in varying patterns, responsible for approximately 800 institutions of higher education, enrolling over 1 million students or 17 percent of the total. These institutions accounted for over one-fourth of all the degrees awarded and are served by 20 percent of all faculty members. While such data encourage an attitude of confidence and strength, one must also cite the figures that described a dreadful history of attrition. Consider one sector: Catholic colleges for men. Of the 194 Catholic colleges for men established between 1786 and 1899, 138 closed; and of the seventy-four colleges established between 1900 and 1957, forty-seven are now defunct. Since autumn 1965, at least twelve Catholic institutions of higher learning have closed or merged.

Neither the great commitment of American Catholics to their institutions nor the depressing effect of attrition and marginality has been lost in the rhetoric of the great debate on the quality and potential of Catholic higher education. Bishop Thomas A. Becker, in April 1876, stated, "our colleges have . . . been very little, if at all, superior to the non-Catholic establishments." In 1955 John Tracy Ellis condemned Catholic institutions for their tendency to pursue "every passing fancy that crossed the American educational scene." Furthermore, he condemned the competition, betrayal, and warfare resulting in the proliferation of institutions. Monsignor Ellis is extremely pessimistic with regard to the future of Catholic higher education, and has continued to emphasize the need for supra-institutional planning. Such observations have been part of a 150-year-old debate on the future of Catholic higher education. These observations were reiterated in a 1964 address given by the Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S.J. In his address, Father Reinert stated that Catholic higher education needed an objective, carefully prepared, flexible blueprint for the general development of Catholic higher education in this country.

> This blueprint should not be imposed by an authority within or outside our own colleges or universities. It should be the result of our own voluntary efforts to accomplish what is obviously needed. Practically, it may be forced on us by the decision of those on whom all of us directly or indirectly depend: the benefactors, mostly Catholic, whose contributions are essential to our future growth and development. Before they move farther towards a unified refusal to support unplanned Catholic higher education, I would urge that we do what is overdue at once.

Save on a few campuses, the impact of new insights has yet to be felt in Catholic higher education. This is not to say that those responsible for Catholic institutions of higher learning are not aware of the data available to them or the pressures toward institutional renewal. They are aware, and, in fact, there is a sense of urgency in Catholic higher education never before felt on our campuses. This urgency stems from at least eight factors.

The first is limited resources. The fiscal strength of Catholic institutions of higher learning must be described on several levels. There are schools where funds are so inadequate that the operation is clearly marginal. Every move is measured in pennies and any extraordinary problem can cause a crisis if not the closing of the institution. In the middle range there are institutions that do not have to deal with daily crises, but on the other hand cannot be bold in the development of their programs, betterment of facilities, or improvement of faculty salaries. At the top there are a few very substantial institutions that are, in comparison with the whole of American private higher education, at least adequately endowed and can continue to reach toward their commitment to excellence.

The second pressure is what may be called professionalism. In short, this is the unrelenting necessity for careful academic and experiential preparation of administrators. More adequately prepared personnel are being appointed to administrative posts, and there is a stress on fully trained faculty. Unfortunately, expedience or availability are still rationalized into policies on many Catholic campuses.

Third is the very human pressure coming from our more highly educated and critical students and younger professors. All institutions of higher learning are tuned into a more insistent and vociferous generation. The particular attraction of a Christian campus and the convergence of pressures for reform has created a milieu that has encouraged an undercurrent of discontent which, while less heralded than the conflicts occurring on many campuses, is nonetheless highly significant for all of American higher education in its implications as patterns of Christian student behavior evolve.

Research by the social scientists, notably on the total campus climate and more specifically on levels of intellectualism (or anti-intellectualism), academic values, and career plans is less understood than the other pressures. The inclusion of this point as a pressure is more uniquely Catholic than commonly realized, for no other system of higher education in America has subjected itself to debate on its rationale for a longer period of time than has Catholic higher education. Catholics, as observed above, are habitually examining their *raison d'être*. They are now witnessing by virtue of research in the social sciences the impact of a more rigorous definition of the problem.

Catholic institutions, though by no means a part of a system, tend to act as if they were identified with the successes or failures of their kindred. Thus, publicity, good or bad, is a pressure which causes Catholic institutions to identify with an institution or announce that "we are not like that" or "it couldn't happen here." Meanwhile, the route to success is emulated or the source of discommoding publicity is quietly eliminated on the campus which claims not to be a part of the "system."

Catholic institutions of higher learning, having their origins in the work of religious orders, have been traditionally chartered as a part of the order, or, if a separate corporation, have had boards of control almost entirely religious. On both counts, there is a quiet pressure stemming from financial and legal problems, and most significantly, from the question of who does own and operate the institution. The role of the laity is the focal point causing many boards to reconsider their composition.

If any pressure toward renewal is pivotal for a Christian institution, Protestant as well as Catholic, it is the Second Vatican Council. Emphasis on the freedom of the individual, ecumenism, and a definition of the Church places increasing emphasis on lay responsibility. The whole style of the Christian campus will ultimately respond to intensified lay involvement.

Last, but of great primacy, is the pressure best described as the need to redefine the meaning of the term *Catholic higher education.* Continued use of this obviously nebulous, and to many irritating, term is deliberate and necessary. The burden of definition rests on every Catholic institution of higher learning, and, if there is such an entity as a national system of Catholic higher education, then the burden also rests upon a national agency to engage in the process of definition and, therefore, to implement its conclusions.

Given these characteristics, *where next* is a real question and one which must be answered forthrightly. The nature of the dimensions that constitute renewal all dwell on a centrality without which no institution can evolve: leadership. Leadership is a quality which lends itself to a multitude of definitions. For the Catholic institution of higher learning, the type of leader needed to answer the futuristic question posed in this paper is one who exemplifies certain characteristics. First, he must understand all the forces impelling the Christian college into the future, not only the pressures noted herein but the specific temper of his institution and its environment. Second, he should be one who reads the very obvious sign that this is not the time for the intensely egocentric manager-statesman, whose fertile mind is the sole source of the inspiration that moves the institution forward. There are, unfortunately, such persons in the academic scene today; genuine renewal on too many campuses has been disrupted by their presence. The future leader of a Catholic institution of higher learning should be a knowledgeable integrator of all the talents which create the climate for progress. The key term is cooperative innovation.

The answer to *where next* for a Christian college and for all of American higher education is in a greater sense of internal and external cooperation. The future of the Christian college can be viewed optimistically if board members, faculty, students, and administrators work to create permanent agencies for the determination of the requisites for renewal. The leader in a

Christian institution must be effective in the encouragement and channeling of talents outside as well as within his institution. He must assume the responsibility for educating other institutions of higher learning—Christian, independent, and public—in their mutual responsibilities for the improvement of American higher education. The point of this paper, and of the whole question of the future of the Catholic institution, is that the future integrity of all of American higher education is in the development of the now highly independent structure into a more cooperative enterprise. The leaders of Catholic institutions have a dual burden: to lead their own institutions toward a full concept of renewal and to assist their secular brethren in solving this problem. To many, this will be an overly ambitious and presumptuous proposal. Perhaps so, but the assumption that *where next* is a question only for Christian institutions is presumptuous.

All of American higher education is under pressure to renew itself. The Christian institution's traditional willingness to discuss its problems openly, whether this propensity stems from strength or weakness, and the experience represented by these institutions, not only in their traditions but in their forward-looking soul-searching, can be of immense value to the public and independent sector as well.

Where next is a question of leadership. Educators in Christian institutions must lead if their schools are to survive; likewise, those responsible for the independent and public sector must also assume the reins of leadership in the drive to preserve and extend the sectarian college and university. When educators in both camps focus on their mutual problems and seek mutual solutions, interinstitutionally, regionally, and nationally, based on strengthened institutions that respect each other, then American higher education can, for the first time in its history, answer the question, *where next?*

Expanding opportunities in international education

PART IV CHAPTER 9

PAUL A. MILLER

PRESIDENT JOHNSON HAS OUTLINED an over-all program to strengthen the international education resources of the United States. Already, our nation's increasing relations and commitments with other countries are placing a tremendous burden on higher education institutions. However, training in the cultures, languages, current affairs, developments, and problems of other countries must receive increasing attention on our campuses.

The International Education Act of 1966 provides a broad mandate to achieve these objectives. This is not foreign aid. The IEA's aim is to improve the whole American educational system from graduate programs to elementary schools so that students at all levels may obtain a clearer perception of our nation's role in a rapidly changing world and a greater competence to adjust to and deal with these developments. This is an enormous responsibility which will require large sums of money to achieve its goal. At the moment we have none; no money at all. However, the interest of the Congress and of the academic community make me hopeful that there will be funds during fiscal 1968, to shape plans and organization.

One of the responsibilities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the administration of the Center for Educational Cooperation. The responsibility of the Center goes beyond the administration of the authority of the IEA. It is to become the focal point for leadership of the international education activities of the United States government.

Among its most immediate leadership functions will be to promote a wider acceptance by American academic institutions of the concept that overseas experience of teachers and faculty members must not be considered a handicap in career development, in the computation of tenure and seniority, in the accounting of health and retirement benefits. This is a beginning, hopefully, of a close partnership of the Center for Educational Cooperation and the educational institutions of the nation.

We who have the responsibility for establishing the CEC know that its ultimate success will depend upon the best ideas of the academic community. We encourage all educators, therefore, to discuss aspects and the range of services which the CEC should provide to meet our common needs in this field. We will welcome recommendations.

We already know that there is not now in existence a centralized service to help find the talented specialists you will need as international programs expand and faculty requirements grow. Therefore, the CEC is now formulating plans to set up under contract or to establish under its own auspices, if necessary, an American Education Placement Center to provide a central exchange for information on those who have an internationally oriented specialty or experience and interest.

Further, there is planned a central clearinghouse for operational data on international education programs or training. These data will be organized by sponsoring institution, location, area orientation, and resources. Such a facility should be able to contribute greatly to efficient program planning, help avoid unnecessary duplication, and encourage the pooling of resources and cooperation between related programs, here and abroad. It is to be a service to the academic community, to research organizations, to government, and to private operations in need of this type of data basic to efficient operation in international education. It should provide information of substantial significance to the consideration of grant applications under the International Education Act.

At this time, too, there is being planned the positioning of senior educators as education officers at several of our embassies to assist in coordinating all American governmental education programs in the country of their assignment. They will be the education advisors to the Ambassador, the representatives of the CEC which will assist them at home and backstop their operation.

What I have described up to now are our present plans for the CEC. I turn now to the larger canvas of international education throughout the country. We are hopeful that the academic community will elaborate this canvas with imaginative ideas and programs. It is offered with a brief outline of our hopes in the field.

First, it seems clear that not all of the universities in this country can hope to become major centers of international research and education. This level of activity is critical as a multiplying factor of trained faculty. However, the sheer expense of arranging for a viable institutionwide commitment to graduate study and research in various aspects of international problems precludes a thinly dispersed and proliferated allocation of the country's resources. Accordingly, a limited number of centers of excellence must be established and developed, deferring to geographical dispersion, yet also and more importantly, to the promise of permanent strength. The centers of international research activity must serve not only the particular needs of the academic and professional worlds related to them, but also as major resources of our government and its effort abroad. It is my hope that the academic community itself could find the means to rally its total planning, quite removed from institutional competition, in order that it could advise the federal government, the private foundations, and other sources of support about how to achieve a stronger national program of international research and graduate study.

The second imperative of planning is to understand the importance of communications within the national pattern of colleges and universities. The experience of the past fifteen or twenty years demonstrates that significant involvement in international programs is not easily handled by individual institutions. The agencies of the federal government, perhaps because of their organizational discipline, and the private nonprofit groups, perhaps because of their specialized interests, have been more successful than the universities in relating themselves to counterpart systems. If this remains true, the commitment to worldwide educational communication that derives from a spontaneous interaction among institutions in this country will bring into bold relief the dilemma of the modern university: how to maintain itself as a detached center of reflection, with the eternal view of civilization in mind, and at the same time maintain worldwide communications devoted to the economic and social development of other parts of the world. It is doubtful that the historic mission of the university can be continued if the universality of worldwide experience does not become incorporated to it.

The third imperative in systematic planning deals with defining the proper contractual relationships between the government, the business community, and the universities. Two distinct and yet interrelated procedures pertain. One deals with the spontaneous partnership and ensuing cooperative ventures among educational leaders and institutions around the world. The other refers to the needs of governments for purposes of official technical assistance, diplomacy, and other forms of public and private policy-making. How may this be related and resolved? How may both be carried out? How may each enrich the other?

The fourth imperative concerns the need for new curriculum materials, curriculum reform, and a review of current materials in order to determine their adequacy. It is to be hoped that some of our colleges and universities will take upon themselves the obligation of becoming centers of materials review, evaluation, and development in this field. In addition, it is my hope that the regional education laboratories will come to consider the field of international education as second to no other in opportunity for pioneering.

The fifth imperative refers to better relationships between higher education and the elementary and secondary schools. Although this need is apparent in the most general sense, it is nothing less than urgent in our hopes for international education. Any breakthrough in increasing the understanding of Americans about other parts of the world must necessarily be based on a pervasive experience which begins at the elementary school level. This leads me to suggest that perhaps the most strategic element in the entire field of international education is the preparation of teachers. New concepts of international education would do much to expand the framework of interest for schools devoted to teacher education. It would provide them additional opportunities for experimentation, and it would place them upon the frontier of helping prepare teachers who express a world view in their teaching.

A sixth imperative is improvement in our exchange programs. Improvements are underway today in the processes which bring foreign students to the United States. A substantial review is being given to those programs established abroad for American students. However, one of the current deficiencies concerns how little we have invited foreign students and foreign-trained faculty to improve our understanding of other cultures. In addition, more extensive programs are required in order that foreign teachers may engage in brief in-residence visits. When that happens, it will be perfectly normal to have joint appointments of faculties between U.S. colleges and institutions abroad.

The seventh imperative is that we begin to think imaginatively about the great promise of educational television as an instrument of education and international understanding. The technological advances in this field suggest a time when people around the world may experience firsthand the similarities and dissimilarities in culture, compare reactions on international policy issues, and see the art of other countries. The mass media around the world have contributed significantly to the rising expectations of the developing countries. It is scarcely ironic, therefore, that networks of mass media may now begin to emphasize ways and means of achievement.

Finally, if education is to be of strategic importance in the world community, educators in the United States have a particular responsibility of exploring all of the techniques of the educational process as it relates both to the fulfillment of individuals and to its instrumental qualities for social and economic development. In the United States, we take education so much for granted, and our faith in it is so great, that we are not so learned as we should be about its relationships to employment, to the public and political processes, and to human resource development. If the United States, so committed to education that one-third of the total population is involved as students or teachers, cannot find the intellectual leadership to internationalize the schools, colleges, and universities, then our very substance as a nation will be in doubt. There is no greater challenge before the leadership of American education.

PART V

STUDENT POTENTIAL

Student participation in academic governance

PART
V
CHAPTER
1

WARREN BRYAN MARTIN

All of us have heard the principal arguments of those opposed to substantive student participation in academic policy formulation and institutional governance: (1) Students are immature and lacking in experiences appropriate to such responsibilities. Impressionable at best, at worst they are irresponsible. (2) Students have a short-term connection with the school and correspondingly limited loyalty. They lack a sense of history or tradition and can bear no legal responsibility for the institution. (3) Students would be bored and impatient with what goes on at most faculty committee meetings and should thank God they are not obliged to attend. Furthermore, they have nothing positive to contribute to the meetings. (4) Finally, if students can do a better job than faculty, they ought to be doing the teaching.

So run the arguments. Based on alleged student deficiencies or student-based problems, the implication is that there would be no objection to greater student involvement if students could measure up to the standards of educated adults. To this two things should be said: First, students measure up well enough to make important contributions to the community of learning; and second, if they are not granted participation, it will not be because of their inadequacies but because faculty and administrators do not want arrangements disrupted that now work to their convenience and advantage.

Consider the contribution students could make to institutional governance. The university is a center of learning, and consequently what is heard in class is as important as what is said. No one is a better authority on what is heard than students. Because we want to improve the educational experience, and because we have no accepted way of evaluating the classroom effectiveness of professors, there is merit in structuring academic committees so that those who learn can work for change along with those who teach.

The university is also increasingly a center of computer-assisted learning, or of learning under the aegis of teaching assistants, educational television, and so forth. When human and mechanical intermediaries are placed between the professor and the student, ways are needed by which students can report on how effective these teaching methods are. All we educators know for certain is that our experiences in an earlier day were not what theirs are now. Furthermore, as the first generation of the Electronic Age, students may be helpful in applying the insights of the new learning, with its emphasis on the convergence of men and ideas as opposed to the tendencies in earlier epochs toward divergence, to curriculum reform and other educational policy matters.

We ought also to remember that nearly 50 percent of the population of the nation is now under twenty-five years of age. Without resorting to claims of majority rule, inappropriate to the campus for a variety of reasons, students can properly emphasize that they are part of a large and important segment of our society. In addition, when the economy is increasingly geared to youth and eager to rush them into consumer roles, when parents push them into vocational choices and social responsibilities, and when the government hurries the young men into the military, it seems unlikely that colleges and universities can continue to characterize the college years as a moratorium between childhood and adult life. When young people come to the campus, they are young adults and should be treated accordingly.

Students of college age today not only have many of the responsibilities of the adult world, but are as mature as the general adult population. Although they have no corner on the moral virtues, students act as responsibly as adults, even faculty, when given meaningful responsibilities.

Of course students have limited experience, a lack of legal obligation to the school, and a loyalty circumscribed by personal interests. But are faculty much different? It would be well to remember how faculty success is measured by job mobility, and how often it is said that faculty loyalty today is more to their professional guild than to their college. Students may identify with a college in a way faculty never will. As for administrators, when the average tenure of college and university presidents is about four years—hardly longer than the period spent by students likely to participate in a college's governance—we should not make too much of the necessity for continuity as the basis for involvement in policy formulation.

The frequent faculty comment that if students can do a better job in the classroom than faculty then students ought to be teaching is of course a caricature. It is aimed at those who want to see more student participation at all levels of the learning experience. And such an extreme reaction is not warranted. There is no evidence that more than a mini-minority of students want to take over the university, in the classroom or elsewhere. Students in increasing numbers, however, are noticing that the academic community, which they had reason to believe was composed of faculty, administrators, and students, does not include students in governance. They see that in most schools, or at least in those with the greatest influence, the "community" means faculty as the ruling class, administrators as second-class citizens, a necessary evil, and students as tertiary, a necessary anvil. But students have contributions to make, and the conviction grows that if students are required to act as anvil, they should also have a hand on the hammer.

The prospects for substantive student participation are not good because the idealism of the idea is obfuscated by the realities of campus politics. The most prestigious colleges and universities organize their academic programs for the convenience of their faculties, not their students; the middle-rated institutions are likely to be organized for the convenience of their administrators, not their students; only the least commanding schools are sensitive to students, and then for the wrong reasons.

In colleges and universities with limited resources and only local appeal, curricular offerings are tailored to the clientele. Students are taught what they want when they want it. Faculty and administration both adjust to this situation, even when they feel their values are compromised. In such schools, students have opportunities for leadership; but because their values are conventional, they follow the lead of practices used elsewhere and do not seek to make their institutions centers of innovation. Thus, where students do have the power to affect change through participation in governance, they settle for conformity to status quo arrangements.

A greater measure of financial stability and a broader base of support give institutions in the middle rank more academic independence, but not so much that their faculties are in control. The administrators are crucial here because the schools' aspirations are greater than their resources and, as administrators function in the center of the eternal triangle made up of constituency, faculty, and students, they allocate, mediate, and make themselves indispensable.

It is not surprising, then, that such colleges become organized for the convenience of administration. In extreme manifestations of this condition, the president gets double the salary of the highest paid faculty member, the best facilities and privileges are reserved for key administrators, and committees meet at their pleasure with agendas skewed to their advantage. The public does not speak of the quality of the academic program at such schools, but of those things that relate to administrative services—social and athletic events, new facilities, grants and bequests.

As for student involvement in leadership, students are typically encouraged to do most where it matters least, e.g., to participate in sandbox government; all policy committees and revenue-producing services, often including the bookstore and the union, are controlled by the administration. Students may be on some committees, but their role is advisory or even ceremonial. In sum, schools in tenuous situations believe that success, or maybe survival, is tied to order and efficiency, to channels more than change; they organize themselves, therefore, to favor administration.

It is in the prestigious colleges and universities that the faculty has academic control, and it is there in particular that they make use of their authority to arrange things for their own advantage. Consider the curriculum. What is taught and how are determined largely by faculty preferences. Although we hear on every hand that the traditional packaging of knowledge is antiquated, and while it is obvious that life does not come to man in the form of subject matter specializations, there is little evidence of curricular reform in the direction of integrative programs or cross-disciplinary courses. The faculty prefer to stay with their specializations, and not least among their reasons are the security and autonomy to be enjoyed in departmental caves.

Also, there is considerable pressure by faculty to reduce hours spent with students and increase time for research. We understand why. Advancement is contingent on research and publication, and the faculty member organizes himself and his students accordingly. And he is likely to resist proposals for mechanisms that might allow students to alter their control over these arrangements.

At the new University of Sussex, in England, tutorials are featured in the first two years of the student's career, with seminars and big classes at the advanced levels. The closest work between teacher and student comes at the beginning, where it is most needed, rather than later, when the student should be able to go forward on his own. In the United States we reverse the process, offering mass lecture courses in the beginning years—the content of which often suggest that books and libraries have not been invented—while small classes, seminars, and tutorials are reserved for departmental majors and graduate specialists. Large numbers of students and administrative necessity are said to require the present method. But there are alternatives, as the freshman tutorial programs at Harvard, Stanford, and Berkeley also show; and the conclusion must be drawn that our much criticized system continues because professors prefer to be most often with students with whom they share intellectual kinship and least often with those whose interests are still alien. Once again our arrangements may turn more on faculty preference than on good learning theory.

Thus, in the first-line schools, faculty support student participation in the governance of social and cultural activities, but resist student involvement in academic planning. There the faculty are in control and mean to protect their advantages.

The challenge today is to organize our colleges and universities into tripartite communities, with faculty, administration, and student body all participating in policy formulation and implementation.

But how would their participation be calibrated? It could be done in the large university, and this would be the most difficult case, by first dividing the university into undergraduate colleges. Each college could be administered by a college council, whose membership would be drawn from faculty, administration, and students. This body would set policy. Since there must be universitywide standards and cohesiveness, there should also be a university council. Membership on this highest policy body would include the university president, the financial vice president, the academic vice president, the provosts of the several colleges, and appropriate proportions of faculty, students, and representatives of the constituency based on the size of the university. The power of the university council could be advisory; but because rewards and sanctions identify authority for most of us, it would be better to make all university personnel accountable to this council. (Legal documents might be carried in the names of a consortium of university council members drawn from those of legal age. They would compose the legal entity. The board of trustees, under this radical alternative, would become an advisory committee. The council would thus be sensitive to, but no longer at the mercy of, the societal situation.)

Governance by these commissions—college councils and a university council—offers a viable alternative both to prevailing bureaucratic arrangements in higher education which favor administrators or faculty and to the proposal of radical students for cogovernment by students and faculty alone. Present organizational arrangements have high productive efficiency but low innovative capacity, while the student proposal would cut out those who constitute a legitimate component of leadership, the administrators, thereby duplicating the error of those who reject that other legitimate component, the students.

Colleges and universities will help to foster good judgment and other qualities of leadership if they can organize themselves to provide heuristic learning experiences that invite students to work with faculty and administration toward building a community where all members are healthy, vigorous participants in governance.

PART
V
CHAPTER
2

On student-initiated courses: some reflections

EDWARD JOSEPH SHOBEN, JR.

OF ALL THE DISCUSSION evoked by recent and vigorous bids by students to introduce into the college curriculum courses of their own choosing, little has centered on the meaning and implications of this development. Much has been said, both pro and con, about student rights in the context of curricular reform, and the debate has sometimes waxed intensely hot about the relationship of students to other components of the college and university community in the making of academic policy. But considerations of the free universities, student-engendered programs of independent study, and student-initiated changes in the structure of courses in a particular institution rarely entail queries about the character and larger significance of such ideas and activities.

Novelty, for instance, is not the hallmark of this aspect of our contemporary student movements. Breath-taking as this form of student initiative may appear to some, it possesses authentic antecedents in the medieval universities where students banded together to hire an instructor to teach them what *they* wanted to know. Despite seven or eight centuries of intervening history, then, we are confronted not with an idea that is intolerably new-fangled and without precedent, but with a variation on a very old theme. The relevant questions, therefore, should surely include those of what factors account for the revitalizing in our time of so antique a notion, and what merits, flaws, and problems are associated with this reactivation of old student demands in the curricular sphere.

In both its medieval and its modern garb, the press by students for instruction in subject matter of their own choosing reflects a deficiency in the social apparatus for meeting the educational needs of youth. Student-initiated courses are rarely sought as a means of entrée into the Establishment; rather, they typically suggest a powerful desire to break the perceived hold the Establishment has on our colleges and universities and to examine domains of thought and information that are regarded as, if not actually *verboten,* certainly neither fashionable nor adequately treated in the formal work of our classrooms.

The indictment that is implied runs something like this: Although we may not have sufficient institutional facilities to meet effectively and imaginatively the complex educational needs of our violently changing era, we have still made admirable progress in enlarging access to higher education and in providing the resources that define educational opportunity (but not necessarily the diverse forms of educational quality). Meanwhile, as our technical machinery has expanded and our material support has grown, our colleges and universities have become more heavily institutionalized, more directly responsive in a variety of ways to other institutions in the larger society, and more ingrown in their own well reinforced ways of functioning. As a result, they have lost interest in themselves as agencies of socialization; they have lost touch with youth and what youth at least thinks it wants to be taught, and they have lost in some significant degree—and not solely in the eyes of activist students—that independence of thought and inquiry that enables the college to maintain that precarious but enormously fruitful balance between serving on the one hand as the critic of society and on the other as the vehicle on which one can ride productively into society's always changing pattern of unfilled roles for contributive persons.

As an indictment, this implication of student initiative is worth taking seriously. American higher education, despite its striking achievements and considerable glories, has yet to face up to the price it may be paying for its relatively new position in the defining and pursuit of our national goals, its rewarding and palpably important services to government and industry, its huge commitment to research, and its emphasis on technical expertise, as against intellectual breadth or an informed concern for the personal growth of students, as the *sine qua non* of faculty membership. Things may not be so bad as they are painted by some of our most vocal critics, but there is a large, hard core of reality in the view that students as individuals are neglected on our campuses, that curricula are seldom developed with any explicit attention paid to student motives or student concerns, and that the academic enterprise is far more oriented to the internal logic of its disciplines than toward either the interests of young people or the urgent issues that darken and disturb our social and economic life. We have provided the institutions, but have we provided the actual experience that permits our youth to feel better able, by virtue of their exposure to college, to grapple humanely and inventively with the whirling world of change that is their inheritance? Read as a symptom of a serious and widespread malaise in the specifically *educational* functioning of the contemporary university, the demand by students for a larger share in curricular planning acquires a peculiar meaning and importance.

There is a second and more positive sense in which it is important. Implied in the demand is the perception, however dim or half-articulate it may be, that people learn essentially what they do. If they listen to lectures on predetermined topics, take notes, and reproduce professorial pronouncements, they are likely to become highly proficient at listening to lectures, taking notes, and reproducing someone else's statements. If, on the other hand, they must plan their learning experiences, arrange for and participate in the execution of the plan, and evaluate its outcomes, then they build up a very different repertoire of behaviors. One suspects that such a repertoire has a much closer relationship than do its more traditional alternatives to the ideal of the self-propelled learner to which we all pay lip service. Although it may be a trifle embarrassing to have students display, even a little unwittingly, a sharper insight into the relevance of learning theory for the business of the college classroom than their professors typically do, the fact of their doing so in some significant degree underscores the desirability of overhauling our conventional methods of instruction, few of which have shown any marked improvements in the past fifty years or more.

At the same time, there are problems. For the most part, student initiative has been directed more toward the *processes* of involvement and self-determination in the enterprise of learning than toward the *content* of the curriculum. One can applaud this stress on process as legitimate and even necessary and still insist that the touchstones of higher education require experiences that derive their character from outside the individual—from the culture and its history, from the dynamics of present-day society, and from the shape of the natural universe as men have come to understand it. To make this point is only (1) to recognize that colleges and universities are necessarily and properly societal agencies, although ones specially privileged to assume a critical stance toward the communities that support them; and (2) to argue that viable definitions of an educated man entail a larger perspective than is likely to be generated by whim, the time-bound concerns of a given moment, or even a healthy spirit of revolt against the perceived irrelevance of current practices. This line of argument also suggests that there is nothing in requirements *qua* requirements that is inimical to the fundamental aims of higher education, which may be generally characterized as the extending of the range of an individual's uncoerced choices, and that there is no inherent reason to expect student-initiated courses to be superior in their educative power to those arising from different sources. It is *not* being contended, on the other hand, that the academic status quo, at least insofar as it affects undergraduates, is at all invulnerable to attack or representative of any high degree of modern wisdom.

Modern wisdom, after all, consists to some degree of identifying the questions most central to one's own time. The formulation of such questions is likely to reflect links with what men have struggled in bygone generations to understand, and may occasionally involve more a change in communicative rhetoric than in intellectual substance. Nevertheless, there is much to be said for the proposition that the spirit of an age is more revealed in the questions it puts most insistently to itself and to its predecessors than in the answers it provides. Certainly some of the misunderstanding between generations is partly a function of a tendency to think in terms of different sets of questions as paramount. When one group is focused on how affluence can be achieved and self-esteem earned through successful careers in work, whereas another group is preoccupied with the nature of selfhood and interpersonal trust in a world perceived as technologized and depersonalized, it is not hard to comprehend their difficulties in dialogue.

Here lies a third reason for regarding student initiative in curricular remodeling as important: it represents a venture, sometimes carelessly and sometimes ingeniously executed, in expressing the questions a generation defines as most germane. Because such questions are typically hard to put in fully articulate language, the efforts sometimes have an overlay of impatience, bad manners, or an alienated disarticulation from the community of faculty and administrators. They remain, however, as signs on the part of the best prepared and, in many ways, the most humanely committed group of young people yet to pass through our college halls. If the continuity of the culture is to be maintained and its processes of change ordered to the needs and nature of man, then these signs must be read sensitively and responded to with understanding and a genuine willingness to examine penetratingly the concerns of youth as they necessarily assume the center of society's ever revolving stage.

In relation to student-initiated curricular reforms, then, the issues put before the houses of faculty and administration seem more difficult, more urgent, and more profound than those that have been modally proposed so far. They have to do with the truly modern recastings of our ideas of what experiences make up a liberating education in our age of change and with the processes by which college environments can be shaped to maximize the availability of such experiences. They have to do with the varieties of arrangements—for there are surely many roads to the same general goals—by which the various components of the academic community, including students, participate in making decisions about course offerings, off-campus work for credit, the nature of instruction as an aid to learning, and the relationship of classroom time to the larger number of waking hours that students spend outside class in the defining of their total education. They have to do with a radical rethinking, in short, of the criteria of our educational enterprise; and it is here, it seems, that the movement toward student-initiated courses presents its strongest challenge.

That movement suggests that some of our ablest and most thoughtful students are dissatisfied and disappointed with our burgeoning colleges and universities at the very time that these institutions have acquired their greatest degree of social support and public vitality in history. In many ways, the dissatisfaction and disappointment are related to a perceived failure in the historic humanizing and liberalizing function of higher education as professional training, specialized scholarship, and consultative expertise in the public interest have won increasing hegemony. In this context our most serious queries are not with *who* introduces new elements into the curriculum, but with the central meanings and significance of our colleges as genuinely *educative* agencies, the values and processes according to which the curriculum is formed and reformed, and the criteria by which any educational exercise, regardless of by whom it is proposed, is judged. Given the contours of the modern world and the characteristics of today's student bodies, there is adequate ground to suspect that a failure to involve students in these considerations will prove a further failure in providing them with the relevant and humanizing opportunities which lie at the root of their quest.

Student participation in effective programs of faculty evaluation

PART
V
CHAPTER
3

PHILIP R. WERDELL

TO DISCUSS STUDENT PARTICIPATION in effective programs of faculty evaluation, one must decide, effective toward what end?

Students are being had. Their education is not preparing them for the world in which they live:

1. About four years ago, a majority of American students did not know the difference between North and South Viet Nam—and many did not even know in what continent they were located. (How many students today understand the background of the Arab-Israeli dispute, the issue of Southwest Africa, and the revolutionary ferment in Guatemala?)

2. Less than a quarter of American students today have *any* interdisciplinary courses. (How many science and engineering majors feel they have an adequate appreciation of the creative and performing arts? How many history or psychology majors could use—or understand how others use—a computer?)

3. For the most part, when students' values change in college, the change is seldom due to the influence of the curriculum. (How many students *understand* that what they are learning today will be outmoded by the time they are middle-aged? How many college students become sufficiently committed to self-education to continue their pursuit of knowledge with equal earnestness after the incentives of grades and a diploma have vanished?)

The problem is not that the traditional curriculum is bad. On the contrary, the present liberal arts and sciences curriculum is far superior to the classical studies of a century ago—rhetoric, mathematics, theology, Greek, and Latin, all taught by rote.

In addition to traditional and valued goals passed on to them by their parents' generation, students in a new age have new expectations. Today's students expect colleges to treat them not only as Americans, but also as citizens of the world—a world threatened with complete destruction if young people do not learn to make it safe for diversity and democracy. Today's students expect colleges to treat them not only as budding specialists in academic disciplines, but also as full human beings who must even now attempt to make judgments in all spheres of knowledge. Too often students have to wedge independent thinking into the free moments between volumes of required reading and sheaves of term papers.

Today's student expects college to treat him as a young, sometimes eager mind awaiting the wisdom of learned professors. But that is not enough—students expect to be viewed as practicing adults who want to become involved in experimenting with faster ways to find understanding and better ways to apply it. Few freshmen have entered college without the hope of greatly improving themselves, and in the process their society. On the other hand, no institution is as capable as the American college or university of so dramatically crushing these precious expectations.

Something is drastically wrong.

For all the money spent on higher education, the curriculum of American colleges and universities remains internationally provincial, academically simplistic, and subtly stifling of the new expectations students bring with them in their innocent and honest appreciation of the problems with which they live. Until the administration, and, more importantly, the faculty, understand how they are misusing their authority, most students are not likely to play much of a role in their own education, much less in educational policy formation.

No one questions that faculty members know more about their subject matter than do their students. On the other hand, it is often the individual student who best knows whether or not he is *learning*. It is the student who best knows when he cannot understand what a professor is saying—or when he already knows everything that is being discussed. It is the student who best knows whether a course is stimulating him to learn more about a subject or boring him to death. It is the student who can best formulate those fundamental and personal questions so bothering him that he cannot readily proceed to other academic matters. It is the student who can best evaluate when he is beginning to integrate the process of learning with the problems he continually confronts in his life.

The major problem with American education is that the teaching of subject matter has been confused with learning subjects that matter. The faculty—and to some extent the administration—have built curriculum models around the goal of teaching a particular subject or variety of subjects. They have assumed, often falsely, that this is the way in which students can learn most effectively.

Worse yet, students themselves too often assume that whatever they learn in a lecture or seminar is the best educational experience they could have had. Occasionally a student will get mad enough to go in and tell a teacher that a course is really poor or could be improved. Often a student will sit through a class thinking what a waste it is. But how many students will take it upon themselves to make their classes better? For the most part, this is just not done. Students just don't care, or else they assume mistakenly that their teachers know *how* they should learn as well as *what* they should learn.

Or perhaps, as John Gardner suggests, their weak position in the academic structure breeds fear. Well, that's not much of an education.

The major task of an effective program of student participation in faculty evaluation is to free students of the notion that their participation is impossible or irrelevant. It is time for some concrete proposals:

1. The *traditional approach* is to encourage student leaders to run a student course and teacher evaluation program. Unpublished questionnaires filled out by students give faculty or their superiors a glimmer of student judgments. Published programs give students subjective information about a course supplemental to the catalogue. The first can help faculty improve their courses and/or teaching methods. The second can help students avoid those courses and teachers who refuse to try to improve. There are hundreds of programs administered by students today, and the analytical and practical guide to *Course and Teacher Evaluation* (U.S. National Student Association, 1966) may be a help to students in initiating or improving such a program. Published *or* unpublished student course and teacher evaluation programs are slow and ineffective at best in reforming higher education, but they are one way to build student confidence that students can play a role in shaping their own education.

2. The newest approaches to student evaluation of their own education have come from free universities and student experimental colleges. In the best of these, students initiate, design, and teach one or two of their own courses. The most up-to-date listing of such programs appears in the HSUNA newsletter of December 1966 (Humanist House, Yellow Springs, Ohio). Several case studies have been printed in the USNSA *Student Government Bulletin.* And Paul Danish's article in the summer 1966 *American Student* (USNSA) offers an imaginative and substantive analysis of their potential. Students who have participated in free universities and experimental colleges have made triple gains. First, they have learned about subjects not treated in the regular curriculum, and possibly in styles not normally acceptable in regular classroom instruction. Second, they have had the opportunity to see and sometimes build new ways of learning for themselves. Third, many begin to have the confidence and experience to ask their regular faculty members better and bolder questions.

3. In the long run, I see action curriculum to be the *most effective strategy* of building student participation in their own education—and thus building students who can be effective in evaluating faculty. This could proceed in many forms. The new Franconia College is the freshest example. Antioch's long-established work semester offers a model. Eastern Michigan's five-year Peace Corps B.A. is another. USNSA is seeking support to build many more models. The importance of action curriculum is that by integrating academic and practical pursuits (for one year, or for one course each year), a student develops the understanding that ideas have consequences and that intellectual pursuits are personally relevant and useful. The theory of action curriculum is rigorously pursued to date in Mike

Rossman's "Radical Educational Reform Within the System" (printed in the *Gadfly* of the *Colorado Daily*, September 30, 1966). Students who have participated in action curriculum have had the opportunity to develop not only new course models and learning styles, but also a working social frame of reference. With regard to their effectiveness in evaluating courses and teachers, this means that students may not only have the confidence and experience to question faculty members within the established system, but will also question an entire institution or the system itself. Possibly, some will learn to persistently ask the most important question of all: Why?

4. The three strategies above presume that there is a group of students on the campus interested and capable of improving their education. If there is none, or if the base is too small, what then? The suggestion of one student leader experienced in these matters might be helpful:

> The major problem I see with present course and teacher evaluations is that the evaluation program becomes an end in itself. The thrust of an evaluation program should be to *begin a dialogue* about a course or the way it is taught. It might be best if the evaluation takes place in the middle of a course. Students and faculty could sit down for a week or so and discuss how valuable the course has been to individual students. If there were complaints, suggestions would surely follow and the course could be restructured or the teaching changed to attempt an improvement. Without this sort of discussion—and without a long and honest effort to improve the course—the evaluation is of little value. In fact, the evaluation might be destructive, for it leaves the false myth that student and faculty are actually trying to improve the quality of education on campus when no such process really exists.

What seems to be suggested here is a mass application of sophisticated leadership training conferences. Instead of only student government leaders being involved, every student is involved in every course. Instead of only traditional student government problems being discussed, every student has the opportunity to focus upon his own education. If faculty members really respond to what they feel are legitimate learning needs of their students, the students might begin to feel they could contribute to the improvement of their own education.

PART
V
CHAPTER
4

Training student leaders

E. G. WILLIAMSON

IN READING THE LITERATURE descriptive of student life in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, we find a widespread practice of treating students as though they were irresponsible and immature, with the end result that they were in a constant state of revolt and warfare against professors. In the latter part of this period there were various attempts to increase students' participation in self-government in extracurricular life and behavior matters.

But during the early nineteenth century Thomas Jefferson formulated his concept of citizenship participation—of each having a part in or being involved in governing himself. In his 1816 letter to Dupont de Nemours, Jefferson says that "action by the citizens in person, in affairs within their reach and competence, and in all others by representatives, chosen immediately, and removable by themselves, constitutes the essence of a republic; that all governments are more or less republican in proportion as this principle enters more or less into their composition; and that a government by representation is capable of extension over a greater surface of country than one of any other form." This is an ideal situation, and the basic roots of this concept and role should be learned by all students in our institutions of higher learning by practice in campus government, in preparation for the later role in the society at large. The basic question is how we entice high-potential student leaders out of their ivied halls and from behind their library books to become involved in matters of leadership and participation in school and community activities and responsibilities.

We are not going to achieve this desired goal by extending to them the dry prospect of mere sandbox participation in college affairs—letting them serve on dull committees to discuss dull topics that really have little meaning to the university policy-making and governing apparatus, while faculty and administrators listen with only half an ear when they have their say about current crises and existing policies and practices, and then dismiss it all as merely students letting off a little steam.

We must rather give them something more worthwhile to stimulate their desire to become involved and to become a contributing agent in the mechanism of government, first on the college campus and eventually in the community at large. We must endeavor to train students in some form of leadership, with this training becoming an integral part of the educational pattern of every college campus. We must first reach the top few, who in turn will be disciples to the rest of the campus.

One method of reaching these students has been developed on my campus. We have developed weekend retreats which exploit various leadership potentials in a partnership among the faculty, administration, and the students. These retreats are for high-ability freshmen, and have been set up deliberately so that an invitation carries definite prestige status. To receive an invitation, a student must be in the upper 10 percent of high school rank, must be in the upper 10 percent on admission tests, and must have a B average or higher. These retreats are intellectual weekends with students and selected faculty informally interacting on topics of current concern to students and to the general public. Outstanding faculty members and experts in various phases of government and education throughout the country are invited to participate. Many have been skeptical at first of the value of these retreats, only to leave enthusiastically expounding their advantages. This kind of extracurricular experience (our "free university" since 1956) triggers in the student aspiration to become more involved in these matters, and encourages him to take a long, intelligent look at his environment and the part he is being asked to play. It encourages him to learn to be this kind of an intelligent leader.

Most of these selected students leave the retreats greatly stimulated, and bring their enthusiasm back to their ivied halls and libraries to influence other students in turn to take a good look around them and to become involved in the university's educational program. This sort of catchy enthusiasm should be continuously nurtured and encouraged by faculty and administration through the extracurriculum.

Another phase of the training program is to give students more responsibility in the formulation of the policies that will govern them in their extracurricular and academic life. If student participation is to be effective, however, the issues must be of consequence to the students. We cannot create imaginary problems and inconsequential activities to keep them occupied and out of our hair. It is not enough to give students responsibilities for other students, as in student government, without giving them any participating responsibility for the institution which sets limits for the students to enforce through judiciary processes.

In this form of student involvement in policy-making, student government plays a very important part. It is through this group that the student body makes known its needs and aspirations. For this government body to be an effective and useful spokesman for the students, it must be accepted by the administration as a legitimate part of the policy-making machinery. We have incorporated on our campus the practice of holding periodic briefing and interacting sessions between the administration and key campus leaders, in which the president and his staff discuss with the students the current campus issues and proposed policies which will affect students. These sessions give students a better understanding of the complex reasoning and needs behind administrative decisions and, in turn, make the administration aware of students' needs and thinking. This program has proved to be an invaluable tool in the prevention of conflict and disruptions on our campus.

The Residence Counseling Program is another effective method of training student leaders for active participation in the activities and curricular government of the campus and eventually for later life in the community. This program introduces the element of thoughtful intellect into the student's out-of-class life and pursuits. He is encouraged to strive for a better existence, for the good life. He is encouraged to make his extracurricular activities facilitate his moral and intellectual growth into a more humane, understanding, and thoughtful member of society. We have experimented with this program, and the results have been most gratifying. Through participation on student-faculty committees involved in policy-making at all levels, the student is becoming an important part of the university decision- and policy-making machinery and is acquiring valuable knowledge and skills for use beyond the college's sheltered walls.

Really, then, the secret of training students in leadership is to involve them in important campus administration and to accept them as worthwhile individuals. The experience they gain will be used in their postcollege lives and in participation in local, national, and international affairs and government. Students must, therefore, be accepted as a part of the academic institution, and not merely as passive recipients of instruction who pay their fare and passively ride the route to graduation, then to be handed a transfer to life in the community at large. We must early identify the gifted few and persuade them to become actively involved so that they, in turn, may cultivate the desire for participation and leadership in all students for the full development of humane persons.

Finding and developing student leaders: new needs and an old despair

PART
V
CHAPTER
5

ROLAND LIEBERT

THERE SEEMS TO BE a touch of sadness in the otherwise winsome history of the profession of college student personnel administration. From the very beginning, a mere five decades ago, deans of student affairs were faced with the irresponsible anarchy of whimsically appointed *ad hoc* student leaders for this cause and that water fight. The fortunate arrival on the scene of student governments with their legitimate leaders and authorized channels offered the promise of citizenship, democracy, and peace in the student body. Alas, the students were conservative in their ways, and they failed to appreciate their democratically constituted voice. Having a student government was clearly not enough.

These were educational institutions, these colleges and universities, so surely the answer was to be found in education. If the students could be taught, as the National Student Association put it in 1954, that the function of education is to prepare students for responsible citizenship, and if student government could be honored as the model laboratory for this role, there could then be no excuse for irresponsible leadership and the *ad hoc* complications of the troublemakers. Trained in the wisdom and principles of Jeffersonian democracy and child psychology, the future deans expected to become teachers, trainers, and guidance counselors. Unfortunately, excuses still had to be made to the impatient faculty and the angry community; for alas, again the students were stubborn, unpredictable, and even unready for the orderly exercise of adult privileges. Should the deans blame themselves for not being better teachers? That, of course, would not solve the problem. It would be better to take the dual approach, necessary, of course, only in extreme and rare situations, of ridding the campus of the unteachables while using more effective means for finding and developing the more teachable student leaders. These practical improvements were readily made.

These were the days of the profession's great intellectual growth. The rhetoric flourished in books and articles and at hundreds of conferences, noting in profound speculations the historical roots and psychological validity of nondirective counseling, directive counseling, *in loco parentis*, student self-government, and even, of course, college student personnel work. These were also the days, so demonstrably perfected in the 1950's, of discovering more and more effective means of finding and developing student leaders.

Now here is where the story gets sad.

The better student leadership, even as manifested in the disreputable National Student Association, suggested at least an era of competence among legitimate student representatives. To increase their satisfaction, some responsibility was passed down to lower levels, to the student governments. The colleges, through the still frequently disruptive students, got involved in the courts; and due process was wisely applauded as a new administrative value. Even with these unexpected contingencies, some of which conflicted with previous principles, the promise of educating for orderly citizenship was being ambiguously fulfilled—when along came two upsetting developments.

The first, and now the most important, was the post-intellectual, bureaucracy stage of college student personnel administration. In a sense, this grew out of improved student leadership, for more staff were needed to guide them in their special functions and to give them buffer-zone access to the rest of the college. The second development grew out of an experience at Berkeley in the fall of 1964. The Berkeley students were among the first in forty-five years to experiment with non-legitimatized leaders, leaders who hadn't even been found before, to say nothing of being developed, as negotiators with the college on important questions of policy. At the very crown of student personnel success, a significant number of students on a significant number of significant campuses chose to ignore the successes and to recreate the same problem that existed fifty years ago. The problem was worse now, though, for these disruptive leaders not only ignored the authorized student government channels, but they brought with them an unexpellable large number who proved that the colleges were not successfully teaching the promising answer of citizenship. The threat of spontaneous and illegitimate student leadership not only remained, but it seemed to grow.

Neither education nor counseling was fully adequate as a response. Instead, the existing channels were reaffirmed, reinforced, multiplied, and extended into new areas such as educational policy. Now the bureaucracy had taken full grip. With its specialized functions, the task of finding and developing student leaders had to be decentralized, perhaps even left up to the students. With its primary emphasis on procedural rules, student personnel administration became practical, functional, objective, a matter of computations and due process. Research on students replaced the teaching of them, and administrators replaced the kindly but often ruthless philosophers and counselors.

Now the ever-recurrent problems created by illegitimate student leaders could be predictably processed by administrators through the hierarchy of the channels of justice. The legal consequences of the students' acts, a hopeful deterrent, were made clear and unquestionably just. Meanwhile, all students were invited to compete for participation in this same hierarchy of channels, hopefully eliminating the need for any extra-legal or unauthorized leadership. Unfortunately, neither strategy has been successful, and the fifty-year-old problem remains. Further, making these transformations into the new bureaucracy meant the loss of much of the earlier intellectual orientation, and the loss as well of much of the ability to find and develop student leaders.

So here is the profession today, wrenched by dramatic new changes from its historical roots, and with its old tasks still unaccomplished but placed instead inside new brackets. These trends are not meant to be typical of all colleges, although they are probably generally evident in most.

The substantial loss of the ability to find student leaders may be lamented by some, while others may not recognize this reality. In the older days, particularly during the 1950's, successful deans of students and their staffs were less limited by current standards of privacy in the keeping of thorough records on students. Besides high school records and notes about college activities, it might have been particularly important to have some objective analysis of the students' personalities, as may be provided by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. House fellows and house presidents could also be trusted to provide some information. On another front, it has been found that letters from various campus CIA consultants to organizations working in the national interest were useful in the selection of students for semi-responsible national student leadership. These and other procedures were most helpful in finding student leaders as long as all of the information could be legitimately collected, centrally stored and sorted, and evaluated by only one or two people distinctly interested in finding leaders. Despite fears of Big Brother, this is probably less likely in today's cumbersome and rivalrous bureaucracies than in yesterday's simple service-club deanships.

The related decreasing ability to develop student leaders is similarly lamented by some and ignored by others. Under older procedures, information—which is a source of power and leadership—could be more carefully controlled in the hands of a few. By giving information to certain students, one could increase their value and attractiveness to other students. Leaking information also leaks issues, which are badly needed by most student governments and legitimate leaders. Periodically, a dean could also get into a dispute with a student he was developing for leadership positions, thereby increasing the necessity for this student to be central in subsequent negotiations. Not to be discounted for a good many campuses, deans could also assist in the selective distribution of honorary rewards, junkets to conferences, posts on campus committees and boards, and even scholarships and jobs. And, of course, on some campuses leadership training programs functioned to give selected students both information and credentials.

Now, however, the scene is more complex. What one dean says another will contradict. Any student can get information from some administrator if he looks hard enough, and he can get somebody else's information invalidated with the same effort. If all else fails, there are the hundreds of indiscreet secretaries that the new bureaucracies provide. There are also so many minor student posts that getting credentials is no longer any great difficulty. In fact, participating in leadership training programs rather than in the real posts is now often considered to be *prima facie* evidence of lack of leadership ability. And since the selection of students for rewards, posts, conference delegations, and scholarships is increasingly decentralized, there can be no consistent policy regarding their function in leadership development. In short, developing student leaders is now more haphazard that it was a mere ten years ago, despite our better and more scientific knowledge of the methods of behavioral control. Perhaps some day we will learn how to use this knowledge.

Yet the process by which student leadership arises can hardly be said to be haphazard, however minor may be the deliberate role that college student personnel administrators play in finding and developing these leaders. For no one can deny that the college social system, as constituted in its many individual forms, provides incentives for certain students to lead legitimately, incentives for certain other students to assume *ad hoc* and non-legitimate leadership positions, and incentives for most of the others to ignore the first two.

Student governments seem to me to be so constituted as to require that the president, the other officers, and even the policy-oriented student legistors have highly generalized interests ranging from the trivial through the service programs to concern for institutional procedure and big policy questions. Most of the legitimate leaders' attention must be devoted to questions of continuity: programs, services, elections, procedures, constitutions, and the many minor administrative chores. Major policy questions become too costly in terms of time and energy, and if this bad money is bartered across the student senate table it drives out the good money of what I have called the continuity questions. Most students know that it won't matter much if the good guys lose the elections. The range of possibilities is narrow, and so is the range of candidates.

Student governments are also so thoroughly legitimized that vigorous disagreement with the administration or faculty is extraordinary, to say nothing of the even more rare shortcutting or misuse of channels. Patience and nearly full faith in the institution's procedures are qualities most appropriate for student government leadership. This can lead to peculiar ambiguities, for, as one college president said to me in the aftermath of Berkeley, "My student government has complete faith in me, but since it received only 15 percent of the possible votes I can have no faith in it." Legitimacy, you see, becomes defined in terms of agreement with the institution rather than in terms of agreement with the student body. This peculiar form of democracy is frequently justified in terms of an assumed implied consent of the nonvoters. But the nonvoters have good reason for not caring and for being poor citizens, as I noted earlier in describing the narrow range of possibilities open to student governments.

It might be argued that the more specialized student-faculty committees provide adequate incentives for the student with interests in special policy questions. At times this may be true. But several problems emerge. First, specialized student-faculty committees are usually not specialized enough unless they are *ad hoc*. Further, the student participants face the same problem of institution-defined rather than constituency-defined legitimacy of role. And finally, committee participation may satisfy the leadership and involvement needs of a few, but an embarrassing share of the rest of the students—with or without such representation—are unsatisfied. The urge to represent oneself, rather than to allow others full prerogative to do so, is not an anarchist trait, but a democratic one taught even in the grade schools.

There are also the incentives for *ad hoc* and non-legitimate student leadership. Whereas it is costly for student governments to deal with the big policy questions, it is equally costly for other students to become involved in the questions of continuity, the due process, and the channels of the institutions. A moral fervor cannot be expressed through these rational procedures. Since the colleges are officially not involved in influencing the community, students may select to use the college in unofficial and illegitimate ways to influence external events. Since some important campus decisions are made at levels that appear to be quite distant from students' legitimate influence, shortcutting processes might be used. Finally, since the big policy questions are typically short-lived, no matter how cynically we may interpret that fact, the leadership must also be quick and brief, typically not wasting time going through the weeks of basic organization and the development of legitimacy.

I think that it is possible for student governments to be organized to encourage a more deliberate, continuous, and vigorous pursuit of policy questions by certain legislative and investigative organs that can even act with some spontaneity. And I think that this could be done in a way that legitimizes the activities not on the basis of any possible agreement or consistency with the institution, but on the basis of student support. I also think that it would be possible to create, upon request, *ad hoc* committees for hundreds of different issues. With an increase in resources, I think that it is possible for student governments to experiment usefully with their own educational reform visions.

But I think that there would still remain a significant number of non-legitimate leaders, trouble-makers, and the like. For I do not believe that due process will ever be made substantially less costly to the impatient student; nor do I think that our rational and amoral bureaucracies will tolerate moral fervor; nor does it seem likely that the colleges will generally choose to set up organs through which it would attempt to influence the community; nor will all decisions ever be made close enough to students as to invite their orderly participation; nor can we expect our electronic, space-imploding age to give us any more time to answer the big policy questions.

It may be possible, then, to improve the quality and variety of leadership in the student governments, even to expand their power and authority. The story of student personnel administration has given us a continuous record of progress in this regard, but it was a record that seemed threatened by recent developments bureaucratizing the field and reducing its ability to find and develop student leaders. However, there is more to good leadership than the discovery and development of leaders—if, indeed, these acts of control really do contribute to leadership. Leadership also involves having something to lead, having a reason for leading, and having a structure appropriate for the type of leadership needed. These aspects of the college system must now be examined and changed in insightful ways if we are to continue toward the ancient goal of student self-government.

But I don't think that it will be possible to eliminate the leadership that gives deans discomfort. They not only will continue in their various and unique forms; but, given the institutional problems that give rise to these leaders, I believe that they should continue. For instance, the current message of these leaders, as I read them, seems to be that the college has lost its soul and its judgment, and that Plato's chariot of life and a million college graduates are now led by the single horse of rationality. I don't suppose that an argument like that can be satisfactorily made by these students through the journals, the committees, and the course outlines on which our colleges now run. However these leaders express themselves, they will be potential threats, although they will more likely be less threatening than the between-classes traffic jams. Some of them will lose an education and a career, perhaps even any possibility for a productive and happy life, through the college's justice in providing them with consequences for their acts. But, despite the many past and future years of effort, you will never get rid of them. They will just keep coming, and as the questions get more and more serious, as they must, they will come in larger and larger numbers.

The student views the college administrator

PART
V
CHAPTER
6

EDWARD D. EDDY

> **Good men become college and university presidents only because they do not know any better. . . . If a man knows what it is like to be a university president and still wants to be one, he is not qualified for the job. . . . The president of an American college or university must instantly renounce his teaching, research and even his reading. He must become just another Big Executive. He will be judged, like every other Big Executive, by the state of his balance sheet and public relations.**

THIS QUOTATION DOES NOT COME from a militant student. It happens to be the militant opinion of one Robert Maynard Hutchins, in an article attacking the idea of an internship program for college administrators in America.

His attack on the college presidency comes when it is increasingly fashionable to eye with suspicion the men and women chosen to administer and lead colleges and universities into a bright new and higher day. If Mr. Hutchins would stand on the rim of the educational canyon, he would hear countless echoes of his sentiments booming forth from the editorials, columns, and letters to the editor of college newspapers. Administration as a profession is tired and tarnished—at least in the eyes of thousands of college students as well as the eminent Mr. Hutchins.

University administration has many of the aspects of big business. I do not speak here, as Mr. Hutchins spoke, of budgets and balance sheets, but of the image business projects. By and large, business has done a poor job of attracting the young idealist to its folds. I am convinced that university administration is just as badly off, if not in worse condition, because it is immediately visible and vulnerable. If administrators expect to replace themselves with those who are better able to cope with education's problems, they had best do some soul searching of the student view of the college administrator.

For the past two years I have been reading student newspapers in order to find out what is on the student mind as reflected in the student press. Let me excerpt a few quotes from four papers which are typical. According to the students, the administrator governs by whimsy and evasion, has two faces neither of which is usually on the campus at any crucial moment, and stands with one foot firmly placed in the past, the other in the future, but without any relationship to the vital present. In most cases the president is the object of attention because he is the symbol of the administration. Hear what a student writes about the administrator's rhetoric of evasion:

> Every time students have tried to resolve some issue with the administration, they have lost. . . . Just by talking the kind of words the administrators use, we trap ourselves into despising the least of us and degrading the best. . . . There is a very powerful rhetoric which demolishes this inhumanity. It is the rhetoric of fundamental human worth. It is the rhetoric of trust. Just as the administration's rhetoric carries within it the inevitable seeds of inhuman success, the rhetoric of trust carries within it the seeds of the best of human tolerance. If the administration would only trust us, we and they might be free.

As if to illustrate by a case in point, an editorial in another newspaper concluded, "The President's statement was merely a conglomeration of mumbo-jumbo, mealy-mouthed clichés. It lacked any understanding of the points central to the issue at hand." But if the administrator cannot get the meal from his mouth, can he at least think clearly? The answer, of course, is no. One student writes:

> I am forced to conclude, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that the administration's position is in fact irrational and self-contradictory, whimsical and unjust. Under most circumstances, I would be willing to accept this, since it is a common characteristic of the privileged, ruling aristocracy. No one expects a despot to be logical. . . . What I dislike is someone who tells me that he can be reasoned with, but who refuses to answer my arguments.

Another editorial observes, "It is strange how the public eye produces coyness in people who otherwise are as bold as brass." That is, if the bold brass stays around long enough to be caught under the student microscope. One columnist reflects many when he writes, "Just who is the President of this University? Does he ever talk *with* students instead of *to* them? What does he feel about the undergraduate population? Is he a prisoner, like Mao Tse Tung? Can he swim nine miles in sixty-five minutes?"

Finally, another newspaper proclaims: "[We have] a President thinking thirty years into the future and a Dean of Students thinking thirty years in the past." But who, the writer goes on to inquire, stops still long enough to be concerned about the present in which the student happens to be enrolled?

I suppose it would be easy to dismiss all of these overblown criticisms as the highly emotional outpouring of a student press which fails to represent the majority and which thrives on criticism of the parent-substitute who tries to administer the parental college. Wisdom cautions us not to dismiss quite so easily, lest we attract into university administration henceforth only those who welcomed us as parents and needed that substitute.

If we wish to replace worn-out administrators with the best of the next generation, we must be far more conscious of the example we are setting. For the sake of the perpetuation of the species, the present-day college administrator better not be guilty of the number one sin in the minds of his students: hypocrisy and easy compromise. He should protect himself by doing all he can to bridge the generation gap.

As one partial possibility, I would endorse without equivocation the present programs of internships which provide experience on the job for those already launched on a career in higher education. But the present programs are trickles compared to the river which we need. It is my suggestion, therefore, that every American college and university institute its own internship program for the top students either just being graduated or a few years out of college. (The latter would be necessary for men because of armed service.)

If each of us would invest $10,000 (or more, depending on the size of the institution) in postgraduation internships for two or more of our most able students who do not intend to go immediately into graduate study or into a compelling occupation, we would build a splendid, high-powered reservoir of potential college administrators who had seen within a couple of years *both* sides of the student-administrator chasm. The interns should not be assigned dirty work or administrative leftovers, but should be asked to sit by the side of the presidents, vice presidents, and deans as decisions are reached and programs put forth.

Not all of them would choose to remain in administration, but at least they would form a nucleus of more understanding and knowledgeable alumni. Furthermore, they would serve the great and useful purpose of keeping each of us in touch with the ways of thinking of the current student generation without compromising the immediate members of that generation. Some of the interns might be exchanged among different institutions so that we would avoid too much inbreeding.

This scheme would give young people an opportunity to see at first hand what administration is all about. They might then wish to undertake some advanced graduate work and return to the multitude of possibilities in admissions, placement, business, public relations, development, housing, counseling, and other administrative areas.

Back then, to the parallel with business: The internship is an approach which many Senators and government offices have found profitable, but which business and industry curiously avoid. And yet business and industry cry out because the students fail to understand the corporate enterprise and because so few want to sacrifice their idealism by choosing a career in business or industry. The student of the affluent times answers, "We know we will be fed, we know where our next meal will be coming from; what we really want to do is something that is challenging and meaningful."

I hope that today's college and university administrators consider their jobs to be every bit as challenging and meaningful as work in any other profession. It wouldn't hurt us in the least to have to show a new intern each year where the problems lie, but where also lie the challenges and the meaning.

PART VI

SPECIFIC AREAS OF LEADERSHIP

The Peace Corps challenge to higher education

PART VI CHAPTER 1

ROBERT W. IVERSEN

MOST PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS come from American universities, are trained for Peace Corps service by American universities, and return to American universities once they have completed their two years of overseas service. This would seem to indicate a healthy symbiotic relationship between higher education and the Peace Corps. In fact, we know that symbiosis can also be antipathetic, and there seems to be a growing strain in the relationship that must be understood and eased if mutually beneficial cooperation is to continue.

The early decision by the Peace Corps to train its volunteers at universities was more a recognition of practical need than of intellectual conviction. No one knew the precise nature of the Peace Corps job, much less the kind of preparation that was required. Universities, after all, had long experience in training for all sorts of tasks, had ample facilities for handling the numbers involved, and were just about the only source of personnel who knew anything about the remote areas for which the volunteers were destined. There were undoubtedly political considerations in scattering the much publicized training programs on campuses across the country. But essentially, the Peace Corps turned to the universities because it needed them to get the experiment off the ground. Now—after six years of resounding success—there is no longer this feeling of need, and the relationship is cooling and badly needs redefinition.

The factors contributing to this tension were logical products of the nature of the relationship and the passage of time. First, the universities were caught up in the early excitement of the Peace Corps and responded almost as if to a call to arms. Improvisation, hasty arrangements, and an air of emergency surrounded the early training programs. But it is difficult to sustain crisis as a way of life, and the universities pushed for more stable relationships.

Second, the Peace Corps, priding itself on a responsiveness to overseas need that put all previous aid programs to shame, demanded a flexibility that could rarely be met by its contractors, whose normal operation was geared to a four-year curriculum manned by tenured professors working an academic year.

Third, university contracts with the Peace Corps were usually for one-shot ninety-day training programs and generally halted at the water's edge.

This did not permit the assignment of staff for an entire academic year—or even a semester—and it rarely permitted any overseas role in planning or follow-up. This made difficult the long-range development of human and intellectual resources which is the university's overriding mission.

Finally, with time the Peace Corps itself acquired personnel—both staff and returned volunteers—who had intimate knowledge of the precise nature of the Peace Corps job abroad. This made university expertise seem increasingly irrelevant, and the Peace Corps became insistent on a dominant role for its own people in the training programs.

The upshot of this sequence was that universities who continued the Peace Corps relationship provided little beyond a facility, while the content and even the staff were directly or indirectly of Peace Corps origin. It was almost inevitable that universities would soon see little advantage to this arrangement and withdraw; it was equally inevitable that the Peace Corps would increasingly turn to nonacademic facilities, where there would be less resistance to their domination of the training program. In separating, however, both parties overlooked the very real benefits each might gain from an open recognition of their real needs and interests.

The mission of the Peace Corps has been neatly summarized in its basic legislation. First, it is to provide other countries with trained manpower; second, it is to promote a better understanding of the American people; and third, it is to promote a better American understanding of other peoples. Reduced to functions, these three objectives are service, teaching, and learning. These are not too disparate from the traditional objectives of most institutions of higher education: teaching, research, and extension (or service). But the similarities conceal real differences in emphasis and timing, which must be reconciled in any continuing cooperative effort. Essentially, what the Peace Corps wants from the university is the following: (1) volunteers who are properly trained according to Peace Corps specifications· (2) a reasonable and justifiable cost; (3) flexibility with regard to numbers, timing, and special training requirements; (4) opportunities for volunteers who have completed service; and (5) possible assistance in recruitment and overseas staffing and support.

The university has somewhat parallel expectations from the arrangement: (1) training assignments in the areas of greatest competence and interest; (2) a commitment of sufficient length to permit adequate planning and staffing; (3) opportunities for the involvement of faculty, graduate students, and visiting experts; (4) opportunities for research, experimentation, and publication; and (5) linkages with other university operations and objectives.

Wherein lie the sources of contention? In general, the Peace Corps would maintain, first, that the university is insufficiently flexible with regard to necessary—and often sudden—changes in numbers, timing, and training content. To which the university would answer that its responsiveness is limited by the short-term contract which prohibits the contingency planning and staffing that such flexibility would require.

Secondly, the Peace Corps would maintain that university training was increasingly irrelevant, unimaginative, and out of touch with the real Peace Corps world. To which the university would reply that reluctance of the Peace Corps to permit a genuine university role in the overseas operation made it difficult to make the necessary adjustments to reality.

Finally, the Peace Corps was increasingly discomfited with the university concern for building its own staff and library, utilizing graduate students, and engaging in research at the sacrifice of the immediate task of preparing volunteers for service abroad. The university would reply, of course, that it could only justify undertaking any *immediate* educational assignment if it was enabled to maintain and improve its capability for *future* educational service. It was in the appreciation of the long-range nature of the university enterprise that Peace Corps activists were most lacking. Their pride in the immediate was accompanied by an intolerance of the long range.

Although the magnitude of their response was scarcely dreamed of, American youth was waiting for the Peace Corps. The time was right for the Kennedy appeal in 1961, and the idea met with overwhelming support. Many of the volunteers flocked to the Peace Corps because it provided the relevance, activism, involvement, and commitment they maintained was missing from university life. They wished to escape from the classroom routine which had dominated their entire lives, and enter the "real world" where they were needed and valued for themselves, and could act autonomously and creatively. In addition, many of them sought a moratorium from the career commitment toward which their college course work seemed irrevocably pointed. They were simply not ready to remain on the managed and manipulated path toward a routinized life, and chose the Peace Corps opportunity to lash out against this predestination. Finally, the Peace Corps did, in fact, offer them roles of power and responsibility far in excess of anything they could have achieved in a comparable period at home. But it also provided them with an existence that was at once protected and at the same time high in visibility and esteem—with an element of the novelty and adventure they felt was lacking on the domestic scene. It seemed literally to provide an organizational framework for their search for identity and autonomy.

It was unquestionably with great chagrin that the volunteers found that the Peace Corps had turned to American universities to prepare them for this new life abroad. Despite the fact that many training programs were highly innovative—in university terms—they were on campuses, and most trainees endured them as the price they must pay for the opportunity to go abroad. Many were surprised at the extent to which the universities were, in fact, capable of altering their ways with regard to tempo, technique, and relevance. Certainly they received more individual attention during the brief training period than they had during their entire previous college careers. Still, they had not volunteered for college, they had volunteered for action. The view received strong support from the Peace Corps field staff which tended to view training a necessary period for processing, clearance, and selection that contributed little to the success of the volunteer abroad, but rather more often to his failures.

While the jobs abroad were incredibly varied, their essential feature was that they were performed in a cross-cultural context. The major ingredient of the context was that it was authoritarian or traditional; the major objective of the volunteer was change; and his most common posture or attitude came to be anti-Establishment. It was heady wine for some volunteers and a sobering experience for others. In either case it was an education, but the precise nature and value of what was learned has not been too clearly defined. It is, nevertheless, important to attempt to define it, because it appears that Peace Corps service is supplying some ingredient of value that has heretofore been missing from the American educational experience. The Peace Corps and its returned volunteers have something to say to American society in general, and the American educational establishment in particular. But what it is, neither they nor we are absolutely certain.

First of all, there are unquestionably elements of the Peace Corps experience that have traditional educational relevance. During his service, the volunteer acquires measurable knowledge and skills, for which he undoubtedly could be given traditional college credit. His two years of service unquestionably constitute some sort of practicum or internship for which there is some college equivalence. Finally, the experience, if planned and guided, could be a rare opportunity for field work or research in any of a number of traditional college subjects. But all this is fairly obvious, and most American universities are making some provision for incorporating Peace Corps experience into their assessment of the standings of returned volunteers. There remains, however, a whole new area of learning about which there is doubt—as to its definition, measurability, relevance, and value as a component of higher education. Only through a much closer cooperation between the Peace Corps and the universities can these learnings be understood.

First there are skills of improvisation and innovation—some would say creativity—that manifest themselves in successful Peace Corps service. Then there are skills of cross-cultural communication and influence that are inadequately defined if confined only to measuring language competence. Closely allied would be the qualities and techniques of leadership which undoubtedly manifest themselves in the successful volunteer, and are presumably relevant in subsequent professional preparation. Finally, and perhaps most important for most volunteers, there has been the self-knowledge they gain from the experience. The autonomy that has come from the positions of responsibility they have occupied; the confidence that has come from the initiatives they have undertaken—whether successes or failures; the identity they have acquired in the eyes of peers and co-workers; the respect they have earned from friends and strangers. These are essential ingredients of education too often lost in academic routine, and they are the major achievement of the Peace Corps. The university which dismisses these as unattainable, unteachable, or worse yet, unimportant, deprives education of its essential purpose. The Peace Corps, I suspect completely unintentionally, has called attention to the missing spark in education, and has demonstrated that the fire can be rebuilt. It would be unwise for higher education to ignore the lesson.

In his now-famous examination of AID university relations (*AID and the Universities,* Washington, D.C., April 1964), John Gardner laid down three guidelines which are equally applicable to the relationship between the Peace Corps and institutions of higher education:

1. "The Federal Agency involved must have a nucleus of first-class people capable of dealing with outside individuals and institutions on terms of professional equality." In this connection, the Peace Corps must alter its policy of relying upon a transient subprofessional staff in conducting its relations with universities.

2. "The relationship between government and the university must be defined in such a way as to preserve to each party independence of action in those functions it must perform unimpeded." Certainly no university wishes to interfere with the Peace Corps' relations with foreign governments; similarly, the Peace Corps should be extremely hesitant to interfere with a university's internal faculty and student relations.

3. "The relationship must be such that each party not only can perform at its best but can gain added strength from its participation." The Peace Corps is obviously at its best in an activism that is highly responsive to unique demands and changing circumstances. The university is at its best in matters of long-range educational and professional development. The partnership can continue only with mutual understanding and respect for each other's objectives.

To date, the Peace Corps has taken the standard government position toward the universities—that of simply buying services as a commodity, with no particular concern for the health of the supplier, since there were enough eager universities standing in line to make it a buyer's market. Overlooked was the importance of long-range university support in the performance of the total Peace Corps mission—which exceeds the mere fielding of people for two-year stints. The real value of the Peace Corps lies in the changes that occur in the volunteers themselves. During their service abroad they commonly change or sharpen career objectives. Most of them return to universities for further professional training. If the Peace Corps' real impact is to be maximized, it has as much of an obligation to prepare people for their re-entry into American society as it has to prepare them for effective performance overseas.

It is here that the universities constitute the natural and perhaps only ally. The university is interested not only in the Peace Corps trainee; it is interested in the Peace Corps volunteer throughout his service; and it is interested in the returned volunteer as he seeks further education and professional training. The segment of interest to which the university has been confined by training contracts does not really represent the true mission of the university or the university at its best. Quite obviously, the university would benefit from arrangements which would facilitate the incorporation of Peace Corps volunteers into its educational mainstream. Equally important would be the establishment of this vital agency as a continuing educational influence rather than as a fleeting adventure in the lives of a relative few.

Higher education as a leader in the urban setting

JOHN E. BEBOUT

PART VI CHAPTER 2

BY DEFINITION, HIGHER EDUCATION is a leader in the development and dissemination of knowledge. In our tradition, this leadership is expected to have high relevance to the conditions and problems of the society. Since American society is essentially urban, and society almost everywhere is in the process of becoming more urban, the leadership role of higher education must be conditioned to the realities of the evolving urban setting. By the same token, it must also be conditioned to the international, or better, the worldwide nature of modern society, as well as to the technological and bureaucratic characteristics of the society, all of which, including urbanization, are interrelated.

By its contributions to science and hence to technology and to the development of the professions upon which our complex, if not yet great, society depends, higher education has been a principal leader in creating the state we are in. It is a commentary on the myopia that higher education shares with other social processes that it has been noticeably tardy in adjusting its teaching and research, as well as its scale of operations, to the new human and institutional needs of the society for whose form and direction it bears a major responsibility.

World War I generated an interest in international studies, but it was not until after World War II and the breakup of colonial empires that the universities began to attack the problem of the world society with any degree of depth and sophistication. Despite the fact that the Census Bureau announced in 1920 that the United States had become more urban than rural, there was little response by higher education. There were, of course, programs in such fields as sanitary engineering and a small but growing number of programs in city planning and social work. But there was no urban-oriented development during the first half of the twentieth century comparable to the earlier land-grant system of interrelated research, education, and extension consciously designed to meet the needs of an agricultural society.

It was not until the late 1950's that the suggestion, backed by modest sums of money, began to come to the universities from outside that perhaps they ought to shape up their programs purposefully to serve urban America in a manner more nearly comparable to the way in which the land-grant colleges had been serving agricultural and rural America. In the last seven or eight years, urban studies centers or institutes and urban-oriented teaching programs have proliferated at a fairly rapid rate. These agencies and programs differ widely in focus and scope. None of them is comparable to the agricultural prototype, but their existence clearly indicates that at least urban studies is "in."

Perhaps more significant for the leadership of higher education in the urban setting is the embarrassingly heavy demand being put upon it by the Great Society programs which reflect the belated recognition by government of the urban condition, especially in its more pathological and threatening aspects. The universities are being called upon in unaccustomed haste to turn out new knowledge and reorganize old knowledge; to supply, educate, and re-educate trained manpower at various levels; to provide wise counsel; and to help devise new systems of organization, communication, teaching, monitoring, and action in the social domain.

There are, of course, great differences in scale and kind between the rural setting of the second half of the nineteenth century and the urban setting of the second half of the twentieth century. There are also great differences between the present system of higher education, embracing both public and private universities and colleges, which is belatedly responding to the urban challenge, and the limited number of land-grant colleges that developed in response to the rural challenge of a hundred years ago. These differences necessarily call for and produce very different responses, a fact that needs to be recognized in order to counter the error of regarding the land-grant college system almost as a precise analogy for a system for higher education in the urban setting.

One common fact about the earlier and later developments, however, needs to be seriously pondered. It is the fact that, in both cases, the universities were initially reactors to demands from outside, especially from politicians. They were not themselves leaders in foreseeing the need and proposing the response. This is not to deny the roles of farsighted individuals in the universities, but it is to say that the leadership of higher education, in both cases, has been primarily a response to demand from the larger system rather than a product of dynamic forces within the educational institution. I raise this question: Can higher education in the future play a more dynamic or active role in anticipating, preparing, and propelling the new kinds of intellectual leadership that a rapidly changing society will require?

Let me suggest a number of issues that higher education should face if it is to relate its program, its structure, and its goals appropriately to the urban setting. In order to get our bearings, we must start with the fact that most of the people to be served by higher education will be living in urban communities, and that all of them will be greatly affected by urban-generated conditions. This does not mean that, because everyone is in fact or constructively an urbanite, we are here concerned with everything higher education has to learn or to teach. We are here concerned, rather, with questions of purpose and priority that are significantly related to the facts of current urban conditions and future urban developments.

The problem of higher education in meeting the challenge to urban leadership is made excruciatingly difficult because it faces at the same time quantitative and qualitative demands of unprecedented proportions. The problem is further complicated by the fact that this double-barreled crisis catches both the educational system and the larger political-economic system without a clear consensus on the role of organized higher education. There is a fuzzy and somewhat frantic sense that, since somehow higher education was largely responsible for putting us where we are, it must play a leading role in seeing us through to the day when we will really be happy, comfortable, and tolerably safe in the worldwide city of man. In the meantime it must somehow try to meet the present crisis by making the best use of currently limited material, personal, and conceptual resources.

The mere quantitative increase in the number of students demanding education is something like the explosive increase in high school attendance following World War I, to which the American high school system has not yet fully adjusted. I make this point to introduce what I regard as one of the most difficult issues now confronting higher education: how to provide the general educational system (primary and secondary schools, the intermediate system now developing in the form of junior and community colleges and technical institutions, and full-scale colleges and universities) with the intellectual leadership it so evidently requires. This raises specific issues of priorities in undergraduate and graduate education and in research, experimentation, and demonstration in the processes of learning, communication, and teaching.

The announced general war on poverty and deprivation due to segregation and other cultural maladies, a war that urban America must continue to a reasonably successful culmination, puts a further heavy burden on educational leadership, at a time when this leadership would be hard-pressed to help a society of relatively equal opportunity adjust to environmental and social conditions in an era of accelerating change.

Higher education must and will continue to produce many more of those scientific and technical brains whose work has produced the urban and technical revolution. But we need to put a much higher priority on the development of leaders of men and molders of institutions—on politicians, on organizers and managers of the highest order, and on leaders of thought and conscience, able to help us conceive purposes and goals compatible with and capable of controlling the powerful new means at our disposal.

One of the most important consequences of urbanization is its effect on the natural environment. Men have always been dependent on the environment, but it was not until the middle of this century that it became apparent that the future of mankind would depend absolutely upon man's treatment of the environment. Until recently, higher education has for the most part simply helped, often strictly for hire, in the exploitation of physical resources. Now it must concern itself primarily with the restoration, preservation, and maintenance of an environment of land, air, water, and organic nature capable of tolerating civilized man for the indefinite future.

In an earlier age, institutions and ideas that had outworn their usefulness might destroy some of those who foolishly clung to them, but there was always room for men to break away and start anew over the next mountain or across the sea. Institutional adjustment and adaptation might come from within, but often came as a result of competition between systems at more or less safe distances. In our increasingly complex worldwide and essentially urban society, there is, of course, still great room for institutional adaptation through competition. However, I suggest that we need to develop a new capacity, based upon new attitudes, for planned social and institutional change, and that higher education will be called upon increasingly to contribute intellectual and moral leadership to this essential effort. The architects of the antipoverty program saw this, and part of the confusion and frustration in the program is due to the fact that we are in a relatively primitive stage in the evolution of our understanding of the management of social change.

One of the crucial problems in this and other areas is of course the competitive defensiveness of the professional and industrial guilds that exercise crucial controls of our system. The universities are both the producers and the agents of some of the strongest of these guilds. If the universities are to provide the leadership required by our evolving urban society, they must find some way of overcoming the fractionization and confusion of effort and purpose produced by this guild system.

This and the other issues I have suggested obviously call upon institutions of higher education, both singly and in concert, to engage in intensive continuing self-examination. At this particular juncture, there is a need for an organized and deliberate reappraisal of many current priorities and practices that are simply projections from the past. This will certainly call for some painful redistribution of resources.

The same joint effort at reappraisal and reorientation should, however, result in a substantial increase in the resources available to colleges and universities; because once they have a clearer sense of self-direction, they can have much more effect than they now do upon the amount and the disposition of public resources at their disposal. Universities should spend less time deploring the ignorance and bad management of the governmental efforts to "use" them, and direct their energies to the active education of both the public and private seekers of knowledge to the proper support and use of it.

The public control of public universities

PART
VI
CHAPTER
3

RALPH D. HETZEL

IT IS HARD JUST NOW to consider coolly the fundamental issues involved in the public control of public universities. The issue of who runs the universities, and to what end, has been hung upon a tall flagpole and is flapping in the hot California breezes. Still, some good may come of it because headlines, for all their black and white distortions, have a way of making us give thought to matters that otherwise might lie dormant.

The question of how public universities should be governed in the United States is an old one. This is because, unlike universities elsewhere in the world, they are governed by lay boards of trustees. It is easy to forget what an extraordinary state of affairs this is and what a remarkable faith it evidences in the wisdom of the inexpert. In the case of the public universities the governing responsibility of the trustees is also subject to the governmental power of the purse.

The record of achievement under these lay boards of trustees is an extraordinary one. The very magnitude of university growth has brought with it a new burst of problems in the field of policy and operation that will test anew the ability of our lay boards of trustees to do what needs to be done. So standing at the summit of great achievements, this is now a fine time to make a reappraisal of the ways and means that the public governs its universities.

I would measure the adequacy of those of us who are acting as the public's agents in these matters in terms of meeting the two imperatives: to make them great; to keep them free.

To be great, they must be free. How dangerously, though, these high purposes can collide, as the people at Berkeley know. One aspect of freedom, especially pertinent to the public university, is freedom from partisan politics. We all agree, fervently, that our public universities must be responsive to the public interest and at the same time be kept above politics. The only trouble is, what is to one man serving the public interest is to the other plain partisan politics. This semantic ambiguity pervades our public life and probably always will. Nevertheless, regents, trustees, legislators, and public officials are all compelled to exercise their educational responsibilities within this semantic confusion.

In one form or other, and some are quite peculiar, the makeup of the boards of public institutions is supposed to enable the board to reflect in institutional policy a sound and wise translation of the public need and interest. Human institutions being what they are, I suspect that it would be a fruitless exercise to debate at length the organizational composition of a governing board to find the perfect structure for public institutions.

Obviously there are those who feel that the public interest is best reflected by boards controlled by members elected from the public, or appointed by elected officials. Others hold sternly to the view that a thick layer of insulation between political officers and the trustees is the best way.

One question that Berkeley should make every governor and state official ask is whether their best interest and that of their public universities is best served by placing them as *ex officio* members of boards of trustees. They may well find there are much better ways for them to exercise their responsibility to education than to be listed as members of trustee boards, when they have so little time to serve and face such difficulties in separating immediate political considerations from the public weal. They are often expected to assume a responsibility in relation to the universities they cannot fufill, and which anyway may conflict with their over-all responsibilities for government policy.

In the end, I believe, whatever the form of trustee organization, the only answer is that there must be fixed in unwritten law, and written law where possible, the proposition that the public institutions must be governed in the public interest in the broadest sense, and fortified by their boards and by public officials against partisan politics.

Not quite separable from the question of politics is the question of freedom within the university. Somehow, the greatness of universities cannot be separated from the freedom of learning, teaching, and researching within the university. When that goes, greatness goes, too.

It is a special responsibility of public trustees, I believe, to stand as a barrier between the university and those who encroach on its freedoms. Since public universities are especially vulnerable in this regard, subject as they are to political attack, it is the special obligation of trustees and public officials to stand guard at the gates. This is not an easy task because freedom is often tested more by the irresponsible than the responsible. Disorder and chaos cannot be allowed to take over public institutions. This makes the burden of trustees at times seem overwhelming, and not capable, perhaps, of being borne by the present structure of usually varied and part-time boards. Most of us are lightly equipped for these heavy responsibilities, but since we are not expected to dig as deeply into our pockets as the trustees of private universities, we should expect to dig more deeply into our brains.

One leading businessman I know, who has served long and thoughtfully on more than one board, comes up with the idea that a full-time paid chairman of the board should be appointed for major responsibilities in the field of relationships with government, top business, and for management of the board. I think the idea deserves thought, though I don't know how the union of college presidents would take to this.

The most urgent problem of universities on the management side is to equip themselves with an effective and adequate structure of top-level executives comparable, if you will, to business organizations of like size and complexity. I don't expect the universities can be run like a production line for Fords; neither do I believe that you can run institutions with budgets up to $700 million a year with the executive machinery of a New England village. I would consider it a prime responsibility of governing boards to insist that the structure of management in the universities must be reasonably adequate to the size and character of the enterprise.

I hasten to balance this emphasis on administration with an emphasis on the role of faculty and students.

Strength of the university administration needs to be matched by strength in the university faculty organizations or by the exercise of faculty voice and responsibility. This is not easy to do. Faculties are not given to easy institutionalization, but it is appropriate, I think, for the trustees to expect an answer to their question as to whether the arrangements for faculty participation in the administration of the institution are well oiled, well regarded, and vocal.

Our University, I am proud to say, has just undergone a reorganization of the University Senate, which has given increased voice to the faculty, reduced the role of academic administrators in the Senate, and put students with full voice and vote upon the Senate committee.

Do the trustees have a responsibility for relations to the students? Of course they do, but they had better exercise it with great humility. It is a long time since most trustees have carried the cow to the bell tower in the dead of night. We must face the fact that what we thought and felt when we were students is no longer pertinent. Students of today are enormously better educated, better equipped, and more determined than we were. They are also more aware of the hazards of the world, more oppressed by the automation of their relationship to the university, and more searching in their quest for meaning and motivation in their world.

Our experience at Penn State has proved that a widespread and expert counseling service can do a great deal to help students adjust both their personal relationships and their academic attitude. A drastic decline in dropouts and a sharp rise in outstanding grade performance are some of the signs that the system has worked well.

Effective student government, so designed that a very large number of students have a feeling that they are participating and that they are doing so on issues of real importance to themselves and to the universities, is the second important project. This may never quite succeed in meeting the needs of a few of the students for whom rebellion, or the appearance of it, is the only therapy.

Third is the participation of students in the development of academic policy. There are certainly ways in which students can be brought more effectively into participation in the development of the academic program and which would give them a more immediate and concrete sense that their ideas and aspirations are taken into account in the process of their own education.

It is a great temptation for trustees to involve themselves in the minutiae of university matters. There even seems at times to be an inverse ratio between the time spent and the real importance of the issue.

Every trustee will have his own list of other things to worry about before dawn, but here are some that keep one trustee wakeful: (1) Does the university have a sound, long-range plan projecting academic, physical, and financial needs of the university ten and twenty years ahead? (2) Is the structure at the university adjusting itself to use effectively the fantastic new techniques of communication? Perhaps this question should be phrased: How can the university protect itself from too much communication? (3) Can the university be restored to human size? Should it be fragmented into smaller campuses? (4) Is the university doing the sort of research it should, or only what it is being paid for?

Higher education and the university-sponsored experimental college

PART VI CHAPTER 4

ADOLPH G. ANDERSON

IN AN OFT-CITED ADDRESS at Hofstra University, Jacques Barzun tolled the death knell of the liberal arts college. If this is an accurate prediction, it comes at a time in our history and that of the world when we can ill afford to leave the intellectually broadening influence of a liberal education to chance.

Perhaps the strength of liberal education is that it cannot be defined. Yet we all have a common awareness of what we mean. It is what John Gardner meant when he used the word "moral" to refer to the shared values that must undergird any functioning society. One can only agree with him that we must develop leaders with a clear sense of these underpinnings of our society. I would suggest that these leaders must also be willing and able to look outside our society with sympathy, tolerance, understanding, and imagination.

But this is not enough. It seems equally vital to create a national and world population that can discriminate in choosing its leaders, that is not easily led by narrow interests, that is not willing to accept one moral attitude toward its own society and a different one toward the rest of the world. As Albert Szent-Györgi recently put it, we can no longer afford to consider murder a sin within our society and a virtue when applied to other societies.

We are clearly faced, then, with the higher education of an increasing percentage and number of our population, not only with respect to technical knowledge (relatively easy, given the aptitude), but also with respect to the much more difficult and subtle job of a liberating education.

Mr. Barzun is right if he is implying that liberal education must find new forms and approaches to meet contemporary needs. I am not at all sure when an individual is best suited for this experience. We seem to assume a strict correlation between chronological age and intellectual need. I have often suggested to students that I would like to try educating a freshman class all of whom had been out of high school at least one year. "Great," say the students, "but we had no choice. We had to go to college." They feel forced into college by society (family, friends, status, the army, etc.) at the very moment when many of them would like to live in the "real" world for a while. Irreparable damage may be done to a student if he is forced to direct his attention to poetry or history when he would much rather be tinkering with a carburetor—which he does anyway, while losing his taste for poetry. An intellectually involved student of forty is surely better than a bored one of twenty.

How can we provide for this kind of meditative and intellectual interlude at a time suited to the individual, rather than to the system? Perhaps we should look hard at the potential of continuing adult education, not as a peripheral activity, but as a deliberate interruption and commitment for an extended period. The continuing education program for women at Sarah Lawrence College illustrates what I mean. The folk high schools of Scandinavia might furnish another model for returning to an intellectual atmosphere, not for more professional training, but for the broadening experience.

No matter when it happens, I am convinced that this kind of intellectual and humanistic growth can best take place for most of us in an atmosphere for learning that emphasizes the free exchange of ideas between students and students, as well as between students and teachers. And there's the rub, because the traditional and classical methods we have used to achieve such a climate are expensive, far beyond what we, as an affluent nation, seem willing to pay, when considering the huge numbers of students. In fact, most experiments aimed at improving education are inherently too expensive for wide adoption.

This represents to me the single greatest challenge facing the experimental liberal arts college today: to point the way toward efficient and effective means for providing individualized learning for the many at a reasonable cost. Since the many are apt to be enrolled in large institutions, the experimental and innovative college existing as a distinct but closely allied part of a large university ought to be in a peculiarly advantageous position.

There are frustrating difficulties associated with such a joint venture. History shows that these difficulties can be fatal; life expectancy for the experimental venture is not great. Certainly a university campus is the last place where one should find resistance to educational experimentation.

The academic establishment should be willing to recognize that there may be better ways than the traditional ones for fostering intellectual growth. In exchange, the experimental unit must be willing to operate in a fishbowl, to expose itself to examination and criticism by the rest of the university. The innovative college will be expensive, as any pilot project is, so it must constantly recognize that its educational obligation to the university is to find less expensive ways to better education; better ways to develop in the students initiative, resourcefulness, independence; and to give a chance to demonstrate these during the undergraduate experience. The experimental enclave can afford to, is obligated to, be revolutionary; the large university must usually effect change in an evolutionary manner, picking out those aspects of the experimental setup that can best be adapted to the larger operation. This implies many lines of communication between the two:

faculty exchange, student exchange, student and faculty workshops, collaborative programs, and many more. There is little benefit to anyone unless there is such continuous communication; without it the two parties go their own ways, having little effect on each other.

Let me suggest a few areas where we might look for some answers to our problems. I have become convinced that a low student-teacher ratio, besides being impossible financially, is not a critical factor in good intellectual communication. The total size of an educational unit seems much more important: ten teachers working with two hundred students form a much tighter community than a hundred teachers associated with two thousand students. I feel there is great promise for the future in such segmentation.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to identify college teaching as a profession, when so many teachers feel put upon if they are asked to spend more than six to nine hours in distant contact with undergraduates. The fault for this intolerable state of affairs lies on both sides, I suppose: a mad rush to build prestige faculties on the part of the administration and a willingness to be seduced from teaching by the faculties. As a start toward improving the situation, I suggest that colleges and universities eliminate multiple occupancy of offices, a simple but effective way to encourage communication between student and teacher. Is it good business to tell your most expensive commodity, in effect, to remove himself from the premises when he is not in class?

I would urge that we explore every way possible to use the technical tools for transmission of knowledge, not to replace the teacher, but to free him for the more important individual and small-group contact with students.

Beyond our professional fields, education is the one area about which we as teachers are willing to speak; and yet most of us have had little outside of personal experience on which to base our profound utterances. Is it not time we learned something about learning? Is it not time we considered *learning* schedules rather than *teaching* schedules? Must we assume that a foreign language can best be studied and learned in the same manner as, let us say, philosophy?

Finally, except in rare instances, we continue to neglect one of the most potent forces for learning, that of students helping each other. We should consider ways to bring the student into the academic community more completely, both as student and as teacher. From what little I have seen of peer learning, here is a great educational opportunity often going to waste.

Continuing education for women: a growing challenge

PART
VI
CHAPTER
5

MARY DUBLIN KEYSERLING

JOHN GARDNER, IN A SPEECH last year, referred to the remaining barriers which still limit the access of all too many of our nation's women to leadership roles in our society. There can be no doubt about it. We are wasting the potential abilities of a very large number of our women—abilities now more than ever needed if we are to fulfill the great purposes of our society.

It is true that more women are gainfully employed than ever before. Nearly 29 million women are in the labor force—more than twice as many as in the years immediately before World War II. Nearly half of all women aged eighteen through sixty-four were workers last year. Yet as a group they remained highly concentrated in the lesser skilled occupations, and this concentration has intensified in recent years. This is shown by many current trends.

Women constitute a diminished proportion of those in professional, technical, and kindred occupations. In 1966 they represented 37 percent of all workers in these positions, compared with 45 percent in 1940. Such a decline in these leadership roles in so brief a time span should be a cause for concern. The proportion of women in the less advantaged fields has increased rapidly during this same period. In the service trades, excluding private household employment, their proportion rose from 40 percent in 1940 to 55 percent last year, and in clerical occupations from 53 percent in 1940 to 72 percent in 1966. Nearly a fifth of our women with four years of college education are employed in these fields.

The increasing concentration of women in lesser skilled jobs is reflected in the widening gap between the median earnings of men and women. In 1965 the median wage or salary income of women who worked year-round and full time was only 60 percent that of men so employed; in 1955, it had been 64 percent. This does not reflect inequity of pay for equal work, which, thanks to new legislation and changing employer attitudes, is now a diminishing problem. Rather, it tells us something about the relative location of women in the occupational structure. We must also be aware that very few women hold highly responsible leadership positions.

Much else might be cited as evidence of wastage of women's skills. We have an acute shortage of teachers in our colleges and universities, yet in

1964 women constituted only 22 percent of the faculty and other professional staffs of our institutions of higher learning. The proportion was considerably higher in 1940, in 1930, and even in 1920. It is only a little higher now than it was in 1910, yet the proportion of all degrees granted which were earned by women had risen 70 percent since then.

Less than 1 percent of our engineers are women, only 3 percent of our lawyers, 6 percent of our physicians, and 8 percent of our scientists. They play a negligible part in managerial fields. The relative role of our women in these professional, technical, and kindred fields suffers sadly by international comparison. It is not surprising that President Johnson recently described this underutilization of the skills of our women as "the most tragic and most senseless waste of this century."

Many factors are involved. Primary among them are ones which pose a special challenge to our schools of higher learning.

Before World War II the great majority of women in the labor force were relatively young; about three-fifths of them were under the age of thirty-five. From the age of twenty-five onward, the likelihood of a woman's being in the labor force diminished rapidly with each succeeding year. There was only one chance in four that a woman aged forty-five to fifty-four would be in the labor force.

We are all aware of what has happened since to transform the relation of the mature woman to the job world. A two-phase lifetime working cycle has emerged. The chance that a young woman will work when she is eighteen to thirty-four years of age isn't very different from what it was in 1940. It's up a little—about 10 percent. It is after the age of thirty-five that we see a very marked difference.

During the period 1940-1966, the number of working women aged thirty-five to forty-four years more than doubled; the number aged forty-five to fifty-four more than tripled; and the number aged fifty-five to sixty-four increased more than fourfold. The woman today who is most likely to be a wage-earner is forty-five to fifty-four years old. Of women in this age group, 52 percent were in the labor force last year.

The more educated the woman, the more likely she is to be gainfully employed. The college graduate, especially, has a high degree of job commitment. Over 80 percent of women college graduates work from time of graduation until they are twenty-five years old. During the peak years of childbearing and rearing, twenty-five to forty-four, the percentage in the labor force drops to 50 percent; but during the succeeding twenty years of their lives it rises to over 60 percent.

While the mature educated woman is now very much part of the work force, it is she especially who is not bringing her full potential into play. All too many women, because their skills are obsolete due to discontinuity in employment, return to the labor force in jobs inconsistent with their own capacities and with society's rapidly growing needs for highly skilled personnel in a very wide range of fields.

It is not surprising that a rapidly growing number of women college graduates see in opportunities for continuing education the means to acquire needed refresher training. Many want to explore their aptitudes for different occupational outlets and develop new skills. Adequate preparation is the key to the realization of potential.

It is not the college graduate alone who has special needs. Only 60 percent of the women who had been first-time college enrollees in the fall of 1960 earned a bachelor's degree during the school year 1963-64. Many among the women who did not achieve the baccalaureate when young will want in their later years to return to complete their undergraduate studies as they see how restricted employment opportunities are unless they do so. More and more, they appreciate that a bachelor's degree may be the indispensable stepping stone to better jobs; it is the prerequisite, of course, to further academic training which is now increasingly required.

Not all those who want to enroll in educational or training courses are motivated by job-connected reasons. Many want to pursue cultural interests. Others want specialized training and orientation for volunteer service, which they view no less seriously as an outlet for skill and leadership than gainful employment itself. Here, too, high-level skill is increasingly needed.

All too frequently, the standard college or university course presents difficulties to the mature woman. Many of those participating in our survey are critical of courses with methodology or content oriented to teen-agers. Such courses often may not interest women with considerable life experience. Other women report difficulty in locating classes that review or update basic information in their fields of interest, or report that the hours local colleges offer are not convenient for them; many mothers want courses scheduled at times when they are not caring for their children. Some alumnae also express an interest in accelerated courses when they are preparing for employment.

The most frequent request of alumnae, we find in our studies, is for individual counseling by qualified persons. They seek highly competent advice about educational and employment plans. College counselors who necessarily spend much of their time working with young people often do not realize the special problems associated with continued family responsibilities and re-entry into the labor force at a mature age. Alumnae also feel that many of their counselors are often not sufficiently aware of existing services and facilities that can help solve their problems. We cannot stress too strongly how great is this sense of need for career guidance geared to new realities at this critical turning point in a woman's life.

Fortunately, many of our colleges and universities are responding rapidly to these special needs of women. The Women's Bureau recently published a bulletin entitled *Continuing Education Programs for Women.* This contains a partial list of colleges and universities with continuing education programs or special educational services designed primarily for adult women. The programs and services of nearly one hundred educational institutions are briefly described. A more comprehensive listing will follow, in response to the demand we have encountered for a more inclusive directory.

Some of the principal features of these programs are limited course load in degree or nondegree programs, flexible scheduling of classes at hours convenient for housewives, liberal provision for transfer of credits, educational and employment counseling, financial assistance for part-time study, child-care services, and job placement or referral services.

These programs are making an impressive contribution. They are meeting diversified needs. I can indicate but a very few examples.

We are all deeply indebted to the pioneering of the University of Minnesota, which in 1960 formally organized a facility specifically committed to making the resources of the University more efficiently and effectively useful to adult women. Now called the Minnesota Planning and Counseling Center for Women, it highlights individual counseling and information services for women at all levels of education. Women are referred to both educational and employment opportunities. The program encompasses scholarship aid, nursery facilities, and job placement services.

Sarah Lawrence College initiated a program in 1962 especially for adult women who wish to resume an interrupted college education on a part-time basis. The women are provided counseling assistance and refresher courses prior to admission as degree candidates. The enthusiastic response to this program stimulated the establishment of part-time arrangements for graduate study also. In cooperation with other universities, the college has arranged for part-time study programs leading to a master's degree in social work, library science, or early childhood and elementary education.

Comprehensive programs of continuing education for mature women are offered by the University of Wisconsin, the University of Michigan, and many others. Some are designed especially for adult women who wish to complete or begin their undergraduate education.

Various colleges and universities have developed general orientation workshops in response to demand from adult women interested in entering or re-entering the work force. These courses typically provide guest lectures on careers, information about educational courses and volunteer work, counseling on both a group and an individual basis, and placement assistance. Among the schools offering this type of continuing education program are Barnard College, George Washington University, and the University of California, Los Angeles.

The Radcliffe College Institute seeks highly qualified women, particularly those with doctorates, and provides generous financial assistance so that they can combine a period of creative education with homemaking. Its expanded program also includes weekly seminars for adult women, a guidance laboratory, and a research program.

Men as well as women adults whose lives are not geared to regular classroom and credit-hour requirements are benefiting from many new types of degree programs which may permit short-term residence requirements;

stress independent study; grant credit for life experience; and offer correspondence study, taped lectures, and programs of learning.

This must be a time for educational innovation and experimentation responsive to a demand immense in scope and significance for both the individual and society. For the mature woman particularly, the availability of educational offerings geared to her special needs may well spell the difference between contribution at a high level and wasteful underutilization of talent.

We are now more than ever committed as a nation to the realization of the human potential. Our colleges and universities, by expanding their continuing education programs for women, can help greatly augment the contribution of our women and their leadership roles.

The junior college: what next?

PART VI CHAPTER 6

JAMES W. REYNOLDS

SPECIFIC TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS come into existence, develop, atrophy, or die in direct response to educational needs. While the response is direct, the time lag between the evolving educational need and the appearance of new or modification of existing types of educational institutions may be as long as fifty years. For the prophet to speak of the future developments in this field, though, he must not examine the institutions themselves, but rather analyze the social environment out of which new educational needs arise.

In the analysis of the social environment, two categories of aspects have been used: the source of educational needs, and factors which have influenced the nature of the institutions created to satisfy these educational needs. Historically, educational needs have been associated with the students served, and with the society which supports the educational institutions. The number of students served has increased appreciably, and the nature of student educational needs has broadened materially beyond the relatively restricted ones of traditional liberal arts programs. Junior colleges today serve students with lesser academic aptitudes than in earlier times, including some students with nonacademic aptitudes. Finally, the greater mobility of the total population has increased the need for prolonged educational services in every section of the country.

Educational needs of society, for sake of brevity, may be subsumed under two fairly obvious headings: occupational and nonoccupational. One variable affecting the nature of occupational needs is that of the constant changes observable in the types of occupations. This appears in the actual disappearance of some jobs—many in the area of unskilled labor classifications—and the upgrading of other occupations into professional status, such as teaching, librarianship, and nursing. A second variable is the appearance of new occupations.

Variables in the nonoccupational phases of society are equally pronounced. Substantial changes are taking place in the internal structure of such social institutions as the church, the home, and government; changes carrying implications of varying educational needs. Another variable affecting needs is that of the shrinking size of the earth as a result of phenomenal progress in communication and transportation facilities, and the urgent need for international education.

Certain factors existing in the social environment exercise definite influences over the educational institutions created to satisfy changing educational needs. One such factor comprises the prevailing mores found in states and in larger geographical regions. Prevailing mores in some of the states, for example, account for the absence of public junior colleges, or for the comparatively late development of junior colleges. These conditions are also explained by regional mores—the reluctance in the Eastern part of the United States to place great reliance on publicly created and supported junior colleges for satisfying educational needs.

A second factor influencing the nature of junior colleges is that of sources of financial support, public and private. Earlier augmentation of local tax support by state appropriations produced marked changes in public junior colleges. More recently, the entrance of the federal government into programs of financial support for both public and private junior colleges has produced noticeable alterations. In the area of private support, once regarded as largely the domain of private junior colleges, the increased activity in behalf of publicly controlled colleges has had an effect. This competition has reduced the magnitude of support which private colleges once had.

Another factor which influences the nature of the junior college is the overcrowding of students on the campuses of four-year colleges and universities. This has led to controlling the number of enrollees through raising admission standards which, in turn, leads to increases in lower-echelon students in junior colleges.

Inherent in most of the factors described is that of technical progress. The effect of this factor is especially prominent in the changes in the nature of educational needs of both students and society.

We now come to the question, what next for junior colleges? In the development of public junior college educational programs, the focus of attention will undergo a 180-degree turn away from the four-year colleges to which a minority of the students go, to the high schools from which all of the students come. In the final analysis, the success of an educational program is measured by the extent to which it satisfies the needs of students. A preoccupation with articulating the junior college program with that of the four-year college denies the opportunity for identifying educational needs while students are in high schools; hence the greater concern for articulating with high schools.

Substantial control of public junior colleges will come increasingly into the hands of boards operating in separate junior college districts. The trend has been in this direction for a long time. Recently, legislation in such states as Kansas, Missouri, and Illinois has accelerated the trend. Moreover, control by state universities will decrease.

There will be a greatly increased incidence of establishing junior colleges in large metropolitan centers with centralized administration and multiple campuses. Concurrently, the large number of new junior colleges being established in smaller cities will increase.

Greater attention will be given in junior colleges to improvement of instruction in classrooms. More and more junior colleges' chief administrators will recognize and act on a need which a comparatively few junior colleges have recognized: the indispensability of a professionally competent dean of instruction. Junior college instructors will be found in substantially larger numbers in the forefront of developing instructional innovations, rather than being reluctant followers.

Student personnel services with an emphasis on strong counseling programs will be found more frequently in junior colleges. This area, neglected in so many junior colleges, will finally receive the administrative support necessary for its development.

The counseling program of the junior college wll be expanded to provide such services for adults in the community. This legitimate part of a community service program will be recognized as a part of the service obligation of the junior college.

As increasingly greater dependence is placed on junior colleges to provide an education for students in the first two years of the undergraduate programs, increasing attention will be given to helping students make realistic decisions about the length in years of their college work. This will weaken the stigma now attached by many students to being classified as terminal. It will also encourage many students who have the potentiality for success in four-year colleges, but have insufficient motivation, to go on for further education. In these respects, "terminal" and "transfer," as titles for classification of students, will disappear.

As junior colleges assume responsibility for educating increased numbers of freshmen and sophomores—of the total number of freshmen and sophomores in the nation, more than half will be in junior colleges—a decreasing concern will be shown for articulating junior college curriculums with those of four-year colleges. The current problem of trying to match the junior college curriculum with a wide variety of four-year patterns, often differing for no valid reason, will disappear since control over the majority of students feeding into four-year colleges will increase the bargaining power of the junior colleges and result in a reduction of the differing patterns.

Junior colleges, faced with competition from area technical schools, will develop good technical programs by absorbing the competition. Many junior college administrators will recognize that the competing technical schools were able to make some progress simply because they were filling a vacuum in technical education created by the junior colleges themselves.

Molders of curriculums in technical-vocational education will, in increasing numbers, recognize the indispensability of general education as a part of the curriculum needed for their students. This will result in their attaching equal importance to both aspects of the curriculum.

The technical-vocational programs will become integral parts of the total curriculum. This will result in directors of such programs becoming administratively responsible to the dean of instruction, and will eliminate their indefensible advantage of having direct access to the chief administrative officer, an advantage which more often than not results in a distorted curriculum and shortchanging of students in technical-vocational programs.

The junior colleges of the future will educate a substantial majority of freshmen and sophomores. It is highly unlikely that there will ever be many four-year colleges which will eliminate their own freshmen and sophomore years. There are too many factors, not the least of which is intercollegiate sports, which will demand the retention of some students for the first two years.

There will be a substantial increase in funds to support junior colleges appropriated by state legislatures. Public junior colleges will continue to receive support from local tax sources. Material progress will be made in the direction of making public junior colleges tuition-free. This will come as a product of providing free public education through the fourteenth year.

Private junior colleges which have in the past competed with public junior colleges on the basis of identical educational services will either be eliminated, enter the public junior college classification, or become four-year schools.

Private junior colleges which achieve the distinction of having outstanding educational programs, outstanding faculty members, and a status of uniqueness will continue to thrive. To do this, tuition rates will have to be raised. It will be found, though, that despite their own rising costs for students and the decreasing cost for students in public junior colleges, there will always be a very real demand for their services. Low-cost public junior colleges will drive out the really good private junior colleges.

The final what-next for junior colleges is based solely on a faintly held hope. It has nothing whatever to do with any examination of the social environment. It is a hope which has been entertained for many years, and little if any progress toward its attainment has been observed. The hope? That the day will come when a sizeable number of people in this country, both educators and noneducators, will have a fairly accurate understanding of just what a junior college is.

Unique problems of junior colleges

PART
VI
CHAPTER
7

ROGER H. GARRISON

MOST JUNIOR COLLEGE PEOPLE exhibit a distinct ambivalence about their status in education. For example, it has been within the past decade that the public junior college has made the major shift from being grades thirteen and fourteen of a public school district to another situation, with local or regional autonomy in over-all governance and financing. In many ways, psychological as well as operational, the junior college heritage has been elementary and secondary schools. But at the same time, the junior college aspires to be—drives urgently to be—a part of higher education.

"We should be neither," says Joseph P. Cosand, president of the St. Louis Junior College District. "We are unique, and provide an intermediate area with its own philosophy and objectives." He rightly points out that the junior college teachers and administrators may well be slightly schizophrenic in this period of frantic growth and transition. "Our teachers want the salary schedule and the security of secondary schools; yet they want the academic rank of the university. They want to teach, and not publish or perish, but they want the teaching load of the university. They want NDEA funds for building purposes which really were for secondary schools—and so they ask the attorney generals to rule that they are secondary education; but at the same time, they want Higher Education Facilities Act money. . . ."

Or, for example, the junior college teacher wants the sort of professional recognition accorded his four-year colleagues, both within his own institution and outside in the community. Yet he does not, apparently, accept the unwritten sanctions that restrain his university colleagues from outright militancy; and he will unionize and strike, if necessary, to have his voice heard at policy-making levels.

Another significant difference is the junior college teacher's typically more direct relationship to the public. The college, more often than not (in the eyes of the community) is relatively new, it's "ours," and it serves not only the youth of the area, but increasing thousands of adults for whom it is a means of continuing education. Like the high school teacher, the junior college faculty member is, in fact, a public servant. After more than a hundred years of free public education, the public pretty well understands its schools. But it has yet to be educated more sophisticatedly about this junior college which insists that it is *not* a high school (though it offers many programs similar to those in comprehensive high schools), claims to be higher education (while teaching air frame mechanics, printing, welding, and data processing), and is obviously wholly unlike what the general public has for years conceived higher education to be.

In brief, the junior college is far from having settled into a familiar pattern. Pressed increasingly by sheer numbers (a graph of student population growth looks like the swoop up to Everest's peak), multiplying special educational and training programs annually—even monthly, hard put already to staff the institutions with fully professional people in every area, it is small wonder that acceptable patterns of governance of these colleges have not yet emerged. AAUP guidelines are of small help, since for the most part these are based on traditional assumptions of college organization and management—yet these same guidelines are used, when opportune, by faculty. Regular high school patterns are, similarly, of little use, since their basic operational assumptions are authoritarian and prescriptive. Both junior college faculties and administrations are groping—sometimes with bruising clashes—for a distinctive pattern of governance, suitable to the new institution.

Among other problems—again, not unique to the junior college, but certainly more than urgent—is the shortage of administrators who not only know the score, but who also have some reasonably sophisticated grasp of the nature of the game they are in. This shortage, in large part, is a result of the comparative youth of most junior colleges: there simply has not been time for the needful cadre of maturely experienced persons to be developed and brought along from the ranks. This, too, will be remedied as junior colleges grow in experience toward more and more clear definition of themselves and their multiple missions. Training of leadership at all levels has high, possibly the highest, priority for the junior college as a whole, whether such training is through in-service experience (as seems most realistic) or by special graduate education.

The faculty of a comprehensive junior college is a mix seeking to be an amalgam. Put together instructors from a land-grant college, a few from an Ivy League liberal arts institution, some from professional schools, skilled journeymen, technicians who are engineers-once-removed, green graduate students fresh from exposure to the guild, retired military men seeking a second career, and high school teachers looking for some pasture in higher education, and you would have at least a raggedly accurate profile. Bring, say, 450 of these diverse backgrounds together to an urban junior college serving 14,000 students (and offering at least eighty different programs). Face them with a college that has grown 425 percent in the past four years, whose faculty veterans have been with the institution less than five years. Involve them in defining the mission(s) of the college—at best vaguely stated in the catalogue—knowing full well that these missions are changing almost monthly. Have approximately 40 percent of this faculty teaching evening division mainly; and have 35 percent of the total faculty on part time. Hire sixty-five new and replacement teachers each year—and find that you really need eighty when registration rolls around. Parcel the faculty into divisions, and divisions into departments, and departments into subdepartments; and, perforce, appoint division and department heads on faith of future responsible performance rather than on tested, long-term observation. Have two major buildings under construction, three in renovation, and seven in the planning stage, having—of course—appointed faculty committees to study needs and make recommendations for the bricks-and-mortar translation of programs (some as yet nonexistent) into usable space. Have two total faculty meetings a year, and accomplish this by the simple, arbitrary method of cancelling afternoon classes each time—otherwise, scheduled conflicts would make a meeting utterly impossible.

As a former university dean, now a junior college president, said mildly, "I've got a different set of problems here."

Another difference between the comprehensive junior college and the traditional four-year institution is in the open pragmatism of the junior college's instructional aims. In its general liberal arts associate degree programs, the junior college has two years to produce a transferable student. General culture is all very well, and honored by constant assertion, but the blunt fact is in the question, "How many acceptable transfer students are we turning out?"

Similarly in the technical-vocational and other job-skill fields, the aim is frankly, usefully to produce employable graduates, whether from a full two-year sequence or from short-term certificate courses in a particular specialty. It is becoming increasingly evident (if industrial recruitment activity on junior college campuses is any measure) that the two-year college will more and more be the major source of technical and lower-level management manpower the country over.

The pragmatic emphasis naturally influences, and often even dictates, the nature of instruction. Teaching must be more immediate, more relevant to clearly seen needs, more strictly sure that the student has "got it." Thus, the teacher becomes, not so much the traditional scholar, but rather the student-of-the-applicable, the needful, the useful. Indeed, a few of the very best junior colleges begin to approach the Whiteheadian dictum that "the school should turn out a pupil who knows something well and can do something well."

The scholarship of a junior college faculty member is more likely than not to be directed toward the enrichment of his teaching, rather than toward the discovery of new knowledge to add to the body of scholarship in a discipline. Indeed, the junior college instructor seeks a healthy symbiotic relationship to university researchers and scholars: he wants to learn how, with increasing skill, to use the fruits of the work of other men with sensitivity and perspective—and with a keen sense of the *utility* of knowledge. This is what his students *need*. This is what he aims to see that they get. His growth, therefore, is toward what could be called the scholarship of teaching—without in the least suggesting traditional school-of-education meanings for this phrase.

Though I am not suggesting that four-year colleges are uninterested in their students as individuals, the student-centered emphasis of the junior college is both a philosophy and a fact. Proportionately, two-year college faculty spend much more time and energy helping individual students than is typically true in universities, even in the lower divisions. Such work is apt to be, in the best sense, remedial, supportive, diagnostic, and is designed to get the student as rapidly as possible to an acceptable level of work. If the difference between philosophies can be oversimplified, it would be: in the four-year college, the student is brought to the discipline; in the two-year college, the discipline is brought to the student. This may smack suspiciously of spoon-feeding or mollycoddling (and sometimes it is), but the emphasis, I think, is just. The hope is, of course, in the junior college quite as much as in the senior institution, that the student will learn as soon as possible to cope independently with a discipline or a skill. A further difference—and it is not a small one—is that the junior college has only two years to try to accomplish this; and the pressure of time is again a major factor affecting instruction.

Junior college faculty problems differ in degree, if not in kind, from those of their four-year colleagues. Listed in rough order of priority, some of these are (1) lack of time, especially for study in one's own field; (2) student loads—in many colleges loads of sixteen to twenty hours and more are common; (3) effective adaptation of instruction to extraordinarily heterogeneous groups of students—challenging superior students while simultaneously helping those who need remedial work; (4) understanding college policies in curriculum development, teaching responsibilities, relationships to guidance, and other areas; (5) lack of clerical help, or lab assistance, or instructional materials, or a dozen other nonteaching supportive needs; (6) evaluating (grading) student work in ways appropriate to kinds of student ability, nature of subject matter, and college policies, if any.

Most of these problems are, of course, familiar to teachers, especially in secondary schools. But in the junior college, dealing as it does with freshman-sophomore age students, and with mature adults from twenty-five to seventy-five (often mixed in the same classes) and insisting, as it does, on being higher education, these problems take on added complexity; and answers to them are far from simple, either for the individual teacher *or* for his administrators.

The comprehensive two-year public college is, indeed, an institution whose time has come. It is a response to a country's aspiration that its citizens shall have open-ended educational opportunity. It is a functional answer to the spreading needs of a technical-industrial society now full tide in a cybernetic revolution. Like most of our social institutions, it will be called upon for ever more and more services, while at the same time—

mainly because of lack of full understanding of the public—it will be endemically underfinanced, understaffed, and overpopulated. That the junior college will solve its problems as time goes on, most of us hope and believe. *How* the problems will be solved—and *when*, if soon enough—and *if* at the high professional level we hope for—are matters that keep those of us in junior colleges restless at night and plague us, on occasion, with bad dreams.

Faculty development programs

RUSSELL M. COOPER

PART
VI
CHAPTER
8

PROFESSORS HAVE BEEN DEFINED as men who believe profoundly in education—for everyone but themselves! They instruct the oncoming generation. They are constantly running workshops and seminars for physicians, engineers, businessmen, and civic leaders. They are even concerned with preparing good teachers for the public schools and other colleges. But seldom does a faculty take seriously the demands of its own development.

Gradually this situation is changing. Students and public have come to recognize the great importance of education, and they are demanding that it be done well. The lazy, pedestrian teaching that gave rise to professorial stereotypes of the past can no longer be tolerated. The vast new learning to be interpreted, as well as the new teaching tools to be used, requires that professors become professionals in organizing their teaching tasks.

Unfortunately, the graduate schools are still not addressing themselves forthrightly to the responsibility of college teacher preparation. The emphasis is still upon specialization and research, with little or no attention to organization of broadly related material for undergraduate students or to the psychology of student learning and evaluation. Fortunately, some universities are discovering that it is possible for their graduate students to do solid work in the subject matter of a discipline and still develop breadth and humanity.

Many institutions have devised short orientation programs for their faculty which sometimes rise above the issues of faculty welfare to consider the background of students to be taught, the availability of instructional resources, and even the principles of learning. Some institutions continue these programs of faculty reinforcement throughout the year. A faculty committee on instruction provides assistance in the utilization of television, films, and other devices. It offers expert consultation to instructors interested in improving their examinations. And it may encourage, and even help finance, promising classroom experiments and research.

These institutional emphases are aided by a number of national and regional programs. For example, the North Central Association has sponsored for over twenty-five years a cooperative program for liberal arts and teachers colleges wherein faculty members attend four-week summer workshops and go back to their campuses committed to the development of some new educational project. Several thousand college teachers have participated in these programs, and there is ample testimony to their impact. Similarly, the Danforth Foundation has during the past ten summers sponsored three-week workshops on liberal education, usually on the campus of Colorado College, at which teams of four faculty members from around twenty-five institutions work on methods of improving their curriculum and instruction. The National Science Foundation has sponsored summer and year-round programs for persons eager to work on the improvement of their teaching. And a few states, such as Nebraska with its Cooperative College Teacher Development Program, are beginning to provide similar service.

Yet these efforts, both institutional and intercollegiate, barely touch the problem. With half a million college teachers in service this year, all these national and regional ventures together will reach fewer than 5,000 persons —perhaps 1 percent of the total. And these come largely from the smaller progressive colleges that are already doing a reasonably good job. Somehow, the advance toward more effective teaching needs to catch hold on many more campuses of the country, if higher education is to prosper. Thus far this has not happened. Why?

1. *Complacency*. College teaching is one of the few professions in which the practitioner has a captive clientele. If a doctor or lawyer is incompetent he loses his cases, and patrons turn elsewhere. But in college teaching there is no such immediate feedback, and it is easy for a professor to assume that the full classes over which he has virtually absolute control are testimony to his prowess. The euphoria he derives from his own lectures, the apple-polishing he receives from some students, and the dominance of his classroom status give him a sense of pride and well-being. In the absence of sharp criticism from students, who are remarkably forebearing, or from administrators, who are preoccupied elsewhere, all but the notoriously incompetent professors may continue teaching year after year without challenge or change.

2. *Inadequate incentive*. Partly because teaching is a kind of secret ritual conducted behind closed doors beyond the scrutiny of administrators, it is difficult for these administrators to identify good teaching and properly reward it. The image of the professor is enhanced more quickly by his publications or his community and professional activity than by his classroom activity. Hence, many universities have come to grant promotions and salary increases more on the basis of publication than of teaching. And smaller institutions often reward campus and community personal relationships that are readily visible. This preoccupation with nonteaching incentives arises in graduate school, where the young teaching assistant frequently feels greater commitment to completing his dissertation than to stimulating his class of freshmen. With the basic goals and rewards lying elsewhere, it is little wonder that many college teachers are static and casual about their classroom performance, that they merely inform rather than teach.

3. *Fatigue*. Young college teachers, serving as teaching assistants in universities or as instructors in liberal arts and junior colleges, tend to have

heavy teaching loads, twelve or even fifteen hours a week. After working up their new courses, perhaps continuing some research commitments, and getting settled in family and community life, their time and energies are virtually exhausted. There is little opportunity for them to try out time-consuming instructional experiments even if they are motivated to do so. Some institutions give lighter loads to instructors during their first year of teaching, but common practice is just the reverse.

From the experience of past programs for faculty improvement, one may derive several generalizations for extending such projects more widely. While a program that works well at one institution will not necessarily succeed in another, the following comments seem pertinent.

1. *Faculty involvement.* Faculty development cannot be achieved simply by preachment or administrative decree. These may not be overtly resisted, but they do not cut deep enough to count. The professor himself must become concerned about improvement, generate genuine questions that he wants to answer, engage in his own experimentation, and exchange ideas with others. From such new experience, there will come not only the stimulus of innovation but also the satisfaction of personal achievement. The age-old principle of education, that people learn best through participation, applies just as truly to college professors as it does to children in elementary school.

2. *Improved appraisal.* At present, the chief evaluation of college teaching comes from the chance remarks of students and colleagues. Since fortuitous comments are dangerously unreliable, many institutions have developed programs of systematic student appraisal of classroom activity. Usually such appraisals are conducted anonymously, with the findings shared only with the professor involved; long experience has demonstrated that the results are usually quite reliable and helpful. In some institutions, audio and even video recordings are made of a professor's classroom activity in order that he can himself appraise the experience at leisure and find ways to improve.

When administrative officers seek to reward professors for their teaching, they often are baffled because the criteria of good teaching are not clear and the information available is unreliable. One promising approach to this problem is to reward the teacher, not only for the quality of his teaching but also for his effort to improve. Under this plan, the teacher discusses with his department chairman or dean the kind of new teaching practice that he wants to try. At the end of the experiment he makes a careful appraisal of results and reports his finding. Such activity is open and observable, capable of being analyzed and appraised, as tangible as a research publication. It is assumed that those instructors who are taking a lively interest in their own classroom performance and engaging in such innovation will also be growing in professional interest and competence. On this basis there can be some confident discrimination when making recognition of the teaching function.

3. *Administrative support.* As Edward Eddy has pointed out, academic people tend to rise to the expectations set for them. If the campus climate is such that good teaching is respected and rewarded, professors will tend to respond accordingly. Administrative attitude is crucial in setting this tone. Such administrative support is manifest not only in financial rewards for good teaching, but also in the encouragement of innovation, travel to professional meetings and workshops, reduced teaching loads for those engaged in instructional experimentation, and publicity for outstanding teaching achievement.

4. *Interinstitutional ventures.* The experience of the North Central Association Study, the Danforth Workshops, and such ventures as the Tampa Bay Teaching Project have all demonstrated that there is a stimulus in interinstitutional cooperation. When an instructor goes to a workshop to discuss teaching problems and then returns to his campus to conduct an experiment, and when this experiment is watched by colleagues of other institutions and a sense of corporate growth develops, the satisfactions derived give much encouragement to continued development. There is here a maximum of faculty involvement and a minimum of administrative domination. Principles are clarified, an explicit program is projected, and deadlines for reporting results are anticipated.

Programs for significant faculty development are still in their infancy. For the institution to aid in the process, procedures must be devised which enhance the prestige of the professor willing to experiment in teaching, give him the personal satisfaction of significant achievement, and provide for interchange. The experience of a number of programs demonstrates that such development ventures can be successful. The situation simply calls for imagination and effort—and leadership.

PART
VI
CHAPTER
9

The faculty senate and educational policy-making

FOREST G. HILL

IN HIS STRICTURES on "The Antileadership Vaccine" John W. Gardner may very well have the faculty senate in mind, especially when he underscores the need "to create better channels of communication among significant leadership groups, especially in connection with the great issues that transcend any particular group." Applied to our larger colleges and universities today, Mr. Gardner's provocative analysis fits altogether too well. As these institutions become big, complex, and heavily involved in outside affairs, they experience nearly all that he describes: the dispersion of leadership, the failure to deal with fundamental questions, the dearth of good leaders, even the vague doubts about the need for and motives of educational leaders. These leadership problems in educational institutions impinge heavily on the function of faculty senates. Furthermore, the role of the faculty senate may prove crucial for the improvement of educational leadership.

Serious problems, but perhaps also great hopes, thus center on the faculty senate. The gravity of such problems can hardly be exaggerated. Many institutions have no faculty senate, while empty formality and apathy or else tension and hostility are features of many existing senates. Doubts and suspicions held by governing boards or presidents often hinder the creation of successful functioning of faculty senates. Boards and presidents are tempted to rely extensively on their administrative committees and staffs for advice as to educational policy. The frequently high proportion of administrators as *ex officio* members of the senate limits its efficacy as a faculty forum. Sometimes its work is further hindered by a dearth of communication with the governing board, reluctance to take up sensitive issues, lack of budgetary information, and the belief that the senate may freely discuss educational policy only when finances or budgets are not involved.

Nor do the problems end here. The senate often has to contend with the vested interests of departments and disciplines, an entrenched faculty oligarchy, the tender feelings of donors or legislators, the wiles of foundations and federal agencies, or the guidelines of state fiscal offices and coordinating boards. When sensitive negotiations are in progress, it may not seem appropriate for the senate to take part in—or even to know about—what is afoot. Even when all this involves basic educational policy, the issues which arise may be shunted to committees of the board and administration, or perhaps to faculty committees obligated to work closely with the administration, rather than the senate. The senate does not always know where the action is, and it may find that significant issues, bodies of data, and even faculty committee reports carry labels of *confidential* or *controversial* which batten down wide reaches of educational policy. To proceed very far in these areas, the senate would have to go off the record, hold executive sessions, or else resort to committees proceeding on a confidential basis far removed from the senate fishbowl.

Despite the seriousness of many of these problems, the senate has a vital role to perform. Such problems exist in the absence of a senate, and an effective one may be able to help cope with them. The senate is, of course, an instrument of faculty participation in college or university governance or policy-making. It is a means for sharing authority and responsibility among the faculty, the president, and the governing board. In other words, it is a device for sharing leadership—for joint action to innovate, make decisions, and motivate cooperation. Mr. Gardner emphasizes the challenges confronting shared leadership in the context of large-scale organization. For instance, different varieties and attributes of leadership are required for defining objectives, analyzing problems, communicating information, and motivating action. Furthermore, he views our decentralized system of leadership in terms of its moral values as well as its problems, its spirit as well as its machinery. Clearly, the faculty senate will have to meet all these challenges.

Colleges and universities of any substantial size soon find need for a faculty senate, especially when they encounter rapid expansion and change. Larger size and complexity induce greater tension and leadership problems within the institution. It runs the risk of rising animosity and distrust, even an explosion, if creation of a senate is delayed. Ideally, its president should be willing to recognize this need and initiate requisite action; there is ample room for other-directed paternalism on his part in establishing a faculty senate, or in revitalizing a moribund one. The senate should represent the entire faculty and be able to speak authoritatively for the faculty. Its *ex officio* membership should be minimized, while its elected membership should not be too parochial or oligarchic. Perhaps election by individual departments should be avoided, in preference to using wards consisting of several departments. In addition, provision should be made for electing a good proportion of members on an at-large basis, with a number of them from the lower professorial ranks.

The senate is essentially an advisory body, in that it advances recommendations which are subject to approval by the president and the board. However, there is every reason for its having prime responsibility to shape general educational policy, even though its advice on such matters must be subject to review. The substantive role of the faculty, exercised through its elected senate, to initiate policy in the areas of its chief competence is to be distinguished from the ultimate authority of the board in a constitutional sense. In this situation the president must play a dual role as agent of the board and as spokesman for the faculty, squaring the faculty's substantive authority with the board's constitutional authority. He has primary responsibility for assuring adequate two-way communication of information and decisions. In particular, he must assure that senate and board understand why they disagree with each other on any major issue.

The faculty senate needs committees and control of its own agencies and procedures of deliberation. The president may appropriately preside over the senate's meetings; however, he must realize that in this capacity he is serving as an officer of the faculty. At some institutions this relationship is made clear by electing a faculty member to chair the faculty senate. Along with the president in his role of presiding officer, the senate needs an executive committee to help plan its agenda, keep track of its committee work, and otherwise promote its business. In particular, the senate must have a flow of relevant information on matters of educational policy, including the necessary financial and budgetary data. Educational policy includes the evaluation of faculty performance for decisions as to tenure, promotion, and salary policy. On matters of educational policy the senate must have the initiative to study and make recommendations even when salary questions and budgetary considerations are at issue. The senate should help make certain that these matters are treated within the context of a long-range educational plan for the institution.

The leadership role of the president should be greatly augmented by the existence of a faculty senate which is willing and able to initiate proposals and express its views on educational policy. There is a manifest need for shared responsibility, entailing a constructive sharing of leadership which can enlarge the innovative work of both the president and the faculty. Each party should be more effective in his own work when both parties are extensively involved in joint enterprises. Given his many problems and frustrations, the president should appreciate the opportunity for enlarged as well as shared leadership. Exploiting this opportunity will improve communication and mutual understanding and trust. The president may thus capitalize on his role as chief officer of the faculty, providing needed information and advancing the senate's deliberations. Especially should he avoid indirection, delay, and uncertainty when acting on the senate's recommendations in his capacity as president and agent of the board. He should not convert faculty committees into administrative devices serving him on a more or less exclusive or confidential basis. Above all, he must strive to maximize agreement between senate and governing board. In this regard his leadership role is pivotal.

Indeed, communication between faculty and board is of such extreme importance that special measures, sanctioned by the president and fitted to each institution's needs, are in order. Since the president is so overburdened, he should not risk trying to suffice as sole intermediary. The necessary interchange centering on the president's role as intermediary may be supplemented and augmented in various ways, all of which may be appropriately informal, solely advisory, and subject to the president's knowledge. In addition to handling reports and referrals between senate and board, the president should arrange occasional meetings of individual senate and board members. Periodically the senate's and the board's executive committees could advantageously meet together. Likewise, other counterpart committees of the two groups might meet to explore their common concerns. Other such devices of joint deliberation may be feasible as well as beneficial in particular situations. The purpose should be to aid mutual understanding, not to effect official decisions; these should be left to the usual independent actions by senate and board, transmitted by the president. However, the need is particularly great for informal communication in order to minimize distrust and misunderstanding and especially to clarify and enlarge the goals and the means of concerted action.

The effectiveness of shared responsibility and interchange among faculty, president, and board may be the key to creative educational policy-making in the complex organizational context noted earlier. This highly involved situation includes departmental and other vested interests and conflicts within the institution. It likewise encompasses the myriad of external relationships with private donors, legislators, granting or contracting agencies, professional and accrediting organizations, and state or regional coordinating boards. At the same time, there are often multiple campuses under one governing board. The participative role of the faculty becomes vastly more difficult and important under these increasingly prevalent circumstances. The faculty senate may help provide a firmer basis for dealing with a distant system governing board and a still more remote superboard for statewide coordination. In several states, notably California, there are trends —no doubt necessary and indicative of future needs—toward the formation of systemwide or statewide faculty senates. If such hierarchies of senates continue to prove necessary, they must be founded on effective faculty senates at the individual campus and institution; otherwise, the awesome problems of representation and bureaucracy and negotiation may prove too complex, even insoluble. To articulate the faculty senate as an integral part of the educational policy-making on a single campus is challenging enough; lest the importance of meeting this challenge be doubted, it is well to remember that far more awesome problems are on the horizon.

The departmental chairman

DAVID FELLMAN

PART
VI
CHAPTER
10

FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE, the drift is toward bigness in higher education, and as our institutions grow ever larger, so do the departments. I would guess that in most of our large, high-quality institutions, the department is not only large enough to permit a considerable amount of differentiation, but is rapidly becoming the most active and intelligible unit in the institution. It would be no exaggeration, for example, to describe the University of Wisconsin as a collection of more or less autonomous departments. Of course, they are by no means entirely autonomous, but they do have a considerable amount of self-determination, and are in many important aspects the most vital units of the University. This is reflected in attendance at departmental meetings, as compared with attendance at general college or University faculty meetings. Again, in my institution, attendance at a general faculty meeting of as many as 10 percent of those invited to attend is most unusual; and the customary turnout is about 5 or 6 percent. Only when some really vital educational issue is involved, such as acceptance of an invitation to play in the Rose Bowl, do more than 10 percent of our faculty members come to the meeting. On the other hand, faculty attendance at departmental meetings is about 100 percent almost all of the time. Only professors who are ill or out of the city fail to attend departmental meetings.

Since attendance at any sort of meeting is altogether voluntary, the explanation for the poor attendance at general faculty meetings, and the almost perfect attendance at departmental meetings, must be found in the fact that the professor senses that the general meetings settle very few matters which deeply concern him, whereas the business of the departmental meeting is genuinely important to him. If he did not think so, he simply would not attend. He knows very well indeed that many decisions which affect him directly and vitally are made at the departmental level. The department is the main unit for recruitment of new personnel and for decisions on promotion of staff; budgets, including salary recommendations, are made up, initially at least, at the departmental level; the department is the chief initiator of new courses and programs; it handles most aspects of student relations; and decisions on such vital matters as teaching load and assignment of courses, sections, and facilities are made at this level.

Just as water will always find its own proper level, so will a professor find the point or points at which his participation is important to him. The department is apt to be at the very center of attention of most members of the faculty. Fortunately, there are always some professors who, for one reason or another, concern themselves with the larger interests and problems of the institution and take an active part in general faculty affairs; but there are only a few of these, and except for most unusual occasions, such as a universitywide crisis following the ruthless dismissal of the president for political reasons, one does not anticipate that very many professors will give much attention to supradepartmental affairs. Like other rational people, professors know not only on which side the bread is buttered; they also know very well indeed just where the bread is to be found.

Since the department is so important in the American scheme of things, it follows that the departmental chairman is, *ipso facto,* important also, for he heads the institution's most vital unit, or, if this is hyperbole, at least one of its most vital units. The office of departmental chairman, then, derives its vitality from the strong position of the department. It follows that such questions as how the chairman should be chosen, what his tenure as chairman should be, and how his authority should be defined and circumscribed are of first-rate importance.

The administrative officer whom I have found to be the most frequently discussed and criticized, and the most widely resented, is the departmental chairman, or worse yet, and more obviously, the departmental head. By a very wide margin indeed, the complaints I have listened to regarding the behavior of departmental chairmen or heads outnumber those about all other administrative officials, at all other levels of authority. Accordingly, I have concluded that nothing is quite so tyrannical as a local tyrant, whether he is a county sheriff or a departmental head. My experience has been that when most professors complain about administrative tyranny, they are talking about their departmental chairmen.

I suspect that the explanation for this phenomenon is fairly obvious. The distance between the professor and the president, in an institution of any size, is apt to be very great. In our really big institutions, many professors literally have no direct dealings at all with their presidents. Those who do not bother to attend general faculty meetings may not even see the president from one year to the next. Even in the major subdivisions of a big university, many professors have no meaningful personal relationship with the dean. But, on the other hand, distances are quite small where the departmental chairman is concerned. He is close to us almost all the time. He is visible, almost always immediately accessible, and in a position to exert great authority in the most direct ways conceivable. The professor cannot possibly avoid dealing with his departmental chairman. The chairman's attitudes and values are bound to matter, and his opportunities for pursuing a policy of harassment, if he is so inclined, are almost without limit.

In organizing a college or university, the most careful attention must be given to the dimensions of the office of departmental chairman. I suspect that what should be avoided, above everything else, is the sort of chairman who is imposed upon a department by administrative fiat, and who holds his position permanently. The AAUP statement on faculty government suggests that the preferable practice is to require election of the chairman by the members of the department. If the chairman is appointed, the appointing authority should be required to consult with the members of the department, and he should normally act in conformity with the advice they tender. In addition, it is the AAUP's position that the chairman should serve for a limited term, though without restriction as to re-appointment or re-election. In my own institution, which I believe has an excellent system of faculty government, departments cast secret preferential ballots each year, and the results are available to the dean before he appoints departmental chairman.

The principle of annual review provides solid protection against the tyranny of an entrenched chairman. But, in addition, in a well-governed institution there ought to be some effective faculty machinery for the ventilation of faculty grievances, at least in aggravated cases. This must be something more than a mere ritualistic gesture. The faculty member should have available to him a procedure which assures him that his complaint will be given serious and responsible attention. I think this can be accomplished best through the instrumentality of a very prestigious elected faculty committee. It should be a small committee, capable of meeting frequently and acting swiftly, and it should be the only one of its kind, a self-confident focus of faculty support and loyalty. If it carries great weight among all parts of the educational community, if it is in a position not only to listen to complaints but also to do something about them, if it commands sufficient prestige to be listened to when it speaks its mind, then the faculty member will not be overborne by a departmental chairman who exercises his authority in a grossly unfair or vindictive manner. Professors have a right to expect that deans and presidents will normally correct abuses of authority at the level of the departmental chairman, but a self-respecting faculty must have procedures of its own to make certain that grievances will be corrected, as swiftly and as decisively as possible.

The departmental chairman is in an especially difficult position because he is, at the same time, an agent of the institution's administration and a member of the teaching staff. He stands at the point where administrative powers impinge upon the professors. He is, on one hand, the leader and chief executive of the department; on the other hand, he is the channel through which the administration exerts authority over the teaching staff. Normally, the chairman is the most important channel of communication, and often the sole one, between the department and the president, the dean, and other departments. He has charge of all official departmental correspondence, and is responsible for all departmental announcements in the catalogues and other institutional publications. It is his responsibility to see that all necessary records of departmental teaching and research are properly kept and are always accessible, and he reports to the dean from time to time on the departmental condition. Such important departmental concerns as recruitment of new personnel, promotions in rank, adjustments in salary, approval of new courses, and assignment of departmental responsibilities are handled through the chairman. He is, in short, the executive head of the department, but he is also a significant link in the chain of administrative authority through which the institution is governed.

In considering the functions of the departmental chairman, however, we must bear in mind that in a properly run institution the faculty has both the right and the duty to participate in a meaningful way in the making of policy decisions at all levels of authority. Since so many important decisions are made in the departments, it follows that the departmental facilities must be permitted to share in the making of these decisions, and the right to do so must be prescribed in the rules and regulations of the institution. All members of the department should have an opportunity to discuss and pass judgment on such questions as those involving curriculum, course changes, and new courses, and the tenured members of the department should share with the chairman the responsibility for such key decisions as those involving recruitment of new personnel, promotion of faculty members, and budget recommendations. There should be considerable flexibility in these matters, with the faculty as a whole or the tenured members thereof having the right to delegate certain authority to the chairman, but no delegation should be without limit as to time and scope, and all delegations should be subject to periodical renewal or withdrawal. The departmental faculty should be, as much as possible, a self-determining group in which policy decisions are made only in the light of the widest possible participation by the academic staff. This is how a self-respecting faculty should operate, and this offers some additional security against administrative tyranny at the chairman level.

Thus, the chairman must look in two directions. To retain the respect of his departmental colleagues, he must keep his scholarship alive and retain his teaching skills. To acquire and keep the confidence of his administrative superiors, he must discharge his administrative responsibilities with intelligence, dispatch, and efficiency. His is an extremely difficult job, requiring diplomatic tact, unremitting industry, close attention to detail, a regard for the feelings and needs of his colleagues, and a mastery of the complicated procedures through which complex institutions function. In an age when the department has become the source of most educational innovation, and the most intelligible and manageable unit of the big institutions, few members of the university community are more important than the departmental chairman.

PART
VI
CHAPTER
11

Departmental leadership in the two-year college

RICHARD C. RICHARDSON, JR.

If there is a dearth of information available on the departmental chairman in the four-year institution, the situation becomes a famine when we examine the literature of the junior college. In spite of protestations of uniqueness, there is much evidence to support the view that junior colleges look to their four-year counterparts to serve as at least points of departure for their own organizational and curricular patterns. For that reason, it will help to begin by summarizing some of the points concerning departmental leadership in senior institutions.

There is general agreement regarding the functions of the departmental chairman in the four-year college. His recommendations in the area of personnel administration, including selection, retention, salary increments, and promotion, are seldom countermanded. He is vitally involved in the development of the class schedule, with all of the implications this holds for such matters as time, place, size of class, and instructor assignments. He occupies a pivotal position with respect to the general scope and specialization of subject matter in course offerings. The chairman is equally well recognized as the vital link in the often tenuous chain of communication between administration and faculty. He may hold the power to confer such benefits as choice office location and furnishings, access to secretarial assistance, and opportunities for participation in consulting or research ventures. In the field of student personnel, the departmental chairman will be closely consulted with respect to matters such as selection of majors and graduate students, credit for previous work, and honors programs. In addition to all of these responsibilities, the departmental chairman must oversee a multitude of routine clerical operations and encourage and facilitate good teaching and research.

The actual, as opposed to potential, power of the departmental chairman is closely related to the method by which he is selected. The advantages of the appointive chairman are primarily continuity and efficiency. The advantages of the elective chairman involve enhanced departmental morale and a greater sense of commitment on the part of those who have a voice in determining their own leadership. One source suggests, as a compromise, appointment of chairmen after careful consultation with members of the department.

There is also the question of rotation. The AAUP opposes permanent departmental chairmen, and this view is shared by many administrators.

Since the power of the departmental chairman bears a direct relationship to his tenure, it is likely that most faculty members would favor some sort of plan for rotation, if only as a threat. At the same time, there is certainly support for a provision whereby the departmental chairman could succeed himself. There are a number of other questions that appear in the literature. There is, for example, the issue of the distinguished professor as chairman in comparison with his less distinguished but more administratively capable colleague. We find also questions in such areas as released time and reimbursement. It cannot be said, however, that sufficient agreement exists in these areas to prove of much benefit as a model to the two-year institution.

Let us now turn our attention to some of the characteristics of two-year institutions.

Traditionally, many junior colleges have begun as upward extensions of the secondary school, frequently sharing a common board. Fortunately, the trend is away from this type of control; however, the secondary school has printed its indelible mark on the organizational structure of many two-year institutions.

A second related factor involves the tendency of two-year colleges to draw upon the secondary school for administrators and teaching faculty. To understand the result of this influence, it is necessary to be aware of the bureaucratic overtones of most secondary school administration whereby teachers are viewed as the workers, and administrators as the managers. It is this type of administration which has led to the growth of union affiliations. The major result of the secondary school influence has been to decrease the faculty members' interest and desire for active involvement in a departmental form of organization and to increase administrative dominance.

A third factor of major importance is the less well-defined orientation toward a specific discipline that characterizes the two-year college instructor in comparison with his four-year counterpart. This is a result of the less rigorous preparation of two-year college instructors, who normally possess only the master's degree, as well as the conditions under which they teach, which usually preclude deep involvement in specialized areas. Junior college instructors are most frequently the purveyors of knowledge rather than the producers of new knowledge. Consequently, the discipline has less importance as the source of the instructor's identity.

In contrast to the three preceding factors, which tend to decrease the importance of the department at the two-year college level, a movement is emerging that should counteract this process. The most significant issue in two-year college education today is the role of the faculty in policy formulation. Increasingly, the faculty of such institutions, many of whom have never been indoctrinated in the secondary school model, are insisting upon their right to be heard on issues of importance. This movement has resulted in legislative action in a number of states and could conceivably act to enhance the status of the department at the two-year college level.

In most two-year colleges, some form of departmental organization exists. In those institutions which have recently been organized and in smaller institutions, the most common pattern is the division encompassing a related grouping of subject matter departments. In large, well-established institutions, a departmental structure may exist within the division pattern; or a subadministrative level of associate deans or coordinators may supervise groupings of departments. The division structure whereby division chairmen are considered as members of the faculty is more directly comparable with the four-year college department and is likely to wield greater power than is the case where a sublevel of line administrators are interposed between the operating unit and the dean.

Departments/divisions (the two terms will be used interchangeably throughout the remainder of this paper to indicate the basic operating unit of the institution) have many of the same responsibilities as is the case in four-year institutions. Their most important responsibility may be regarded as communication, but, in addition, they play important roles in the scheduling and teaching of classes, the construction of the budget, employment, retention and promotion of staff, establishment of admission requirements for majors, and other related responsibilities. Perhaps the major difference between four-year and two-year college departmental chairmen is the greater likelihood that the latter will be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the administration. Those departmental chairmen who handle administrative tasks well are likely to be continued in office even though there is normally some provision for rotation. Administrators usually view them as members of the administrative team. The role of the departmental chairman as viewed by the faculty member will vary depending upon the success of the chairman in involving and consulting department members in matters affecting the department.

The departmental chairman in the two-year college is, like his colleague at the university, a person of considerable power. Since administrators come to depend upon his recommendations, it is safe to say that in two-year colleges having well-developed departmental organizations, the departmental chairman may well be the key figure in the implementation of the instructional program. If a trend is discernible, it is in the direction of greater power for the departmental chairman since the combination of factors operating which include indefinite tenure and appointive status for the departmental chairman, along with the tendency of two-year colleges to have much less sophisticated administrative structures, all point toward enhancement and consolidation of departmental power.

While the two-year college generally escapes the dilemma of distinguished professor versus capable administrator, there is a tendency to endow the possessor of the doctorate with special status. This tendency has in some instances resulted in inferior departmental leadership and a certain amount of hostility on the part of those who do not possess the terminal degree. At the same time, two-year colleges are somewhat notorious for their failure to provide departmental chairmen with the necessary released time and clerical assistance to make the department a really functioning unit.

The departmental chairman ought to be a person of real power in the two-year college. He should have the responsibilities outlined for his four-year counterpart, including employment and evaluation of staff, scheduling and supervision of instruction, construction and administration of the budget, communication, and providing leadership for the department. In order to fulfill these important and complex responsibilities, the departmental chairman must have adequate released time and clerical assistance. While these responsibilities need to be carried out within an administrative framework, departmental chairmen should have direct access to the officer of the institution having primary responsibility for the instructional program (normally the academic dean).

The departmental chairman is, by necessity, an administrator; he must also be a teacher. In this way, he may help to bridge the all too frequent chasm between administration and faculty. In accomplishing this essential role of interpretation, he must aim at nothing less than the establishment of a colleagueship between the two groups. If higher education is to avoid developing into two mutually exclusive and hostile camps, the departmental chairman may well be the critical factor.

The chairman must also accept the responsibility for leading his colleagues to the point where they are ready to accept the responsibilities of self-determination. Far too frequently, junior college instructors lament their lack of power in determining institutional policy while at the same time remaining committed to the passive role which they learned to accept as secondary school instructors. The mark of the neophyte administrator is the desire to accomplish responsibilities independent of the actions of others. Departmental chairmen must involve their faculties, and in this way teach leadership and democratic endeavor.

Two-year college administrative staffs are not as complex as those of four-year institutions. This places greater administrative responsibility at the departmental level. For this reason, it would not seem appropriate to have departmental chairmen elected to serve definite terms. Instead, one of two procedures might be substituted.

In the first approach, the administrator responsible for the instructional program would select the most able individual after interviewing and reviewing the qualifications of all of those who were interested in being considered. Prior to announcing the appointment, the administrator would consult with department members to ensure that the choice was acceptable. As an alternative, members of a department could be asked to list in rank order their preferences for departmental chairman. The administrator would be required to select one of the top three individuals identified through the balloting, although this would not necessarily be the individual receiving the highest rating. Presumably, department members would not have to list any individual who was unacceptable to them.

Regardless of the method used in selection, the departmental chairman would serve for a defined term, perhaps two or three years. At the end of that term, his performance would be reviewed both by the department through balloting and by the administration. If he was unacceptable to either, a new chairman would be selected. If, however, there was consensus regarding the desirability of retaining a given chairman, he could serve for as many terms as seemed desirable.

Recruitment of faculty for the community and junior colleges

PART VI
CHAPTER 12

CLIFFORD G. ERICKSON

THE COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES are the fastest-growing segment of higher education. New institutions are being established at the rate of one a week. Enrollment trend lines are surpassing even the most optimistic estimates. The quality of these institutions is and will be determined by the competence of their faculties.

Experience shows that junior college teachers are recruited from university faculties, high school faculties, graduate schools, industry, and other professions. Junior colleges which have been founded in association with high school districts may show the largest percentage of teachers recruited from high schools. Urban junior colleges with separate districts, separate boards of directors, adequate salary schedules, and aggressive methods of regional and national recruitment report lower percentages of former high school teachers.

A fall 1966 survey of prior appointment of full-time teachers in Illinois public junior colleges showed 40 percent from high schools, 16 percent from senior colleges, 13 percent from industry, 11 percent from other junior colleges, 10 percent from new graduates, and 10 percent from other avenues.

Industry, the professions, and government are sources of faculty members for specialized courses in occupational curricula in such fields as business, technology, health science, and public service. Many of these people serve as part-time lecturers in their field of competence. Some can be encouraged to become full-time faculty members in such fields as data processing, dental technology, drafting, engineering technology, accounting, and others.

The community college recruiter is looking for a prospective teacher who has academic competence as shown by a minimum of a master's degree with twenty hours in the subject field and/or a number of years of applied experience which may add substantially to his competence in the applied field. He is also looking for a person who is interested in teaching, in the learning process, and in counseling and guiding students in comprehensive education offerings oriented to general education, preprofessional education, and occupational education leading to employment.

The junior college recruiter is looking for people who are creative for the development of innovative programs of instruction and new curricula in a variety of occupational fields and who can relate to agencies and groups of people in the larger community. The community college faculty will be engaged with community advisory bodies in defining curriculum goals, selecting courses, developing internship experiences for students, and placing graduates of occupational programs in the local employment milieu. He is also looking for people who are willing to participate in the development of specifications for new kinds of learning spaces and equipment and in meeting the many problems attending the rapid growth and development of campus facilities and instructional programs.

Orientation of new faculty members to the community college's philosophy and purposes becomes of prime importance. Community colleges organize faculty conferences and retreats which help old and new faculty members to place institutional purposes in focus. Faculty participation in curriculum development and academic policy formulation makes possible continuation of this orientation on an in-service basis. Placing inexperienced graduates with seasoned teachers in departmental and committee responsibilities enhances this experience. Allowances for travel and encouragement of participation in professional activities in the subject area of the junior college and higher education fields can promote professional growth. Teachers recruited from commerce and industry and government should be oriented to the field of education. Seminars and concurrent graduate work in higher education and in the subject area can provide added background.

A few problems face community and junior college recruiters. First, there is the problem of the identity of the institution at the local, state, or national level. There remain a few states where the public junior college is legally a part of secondary education. As new state plans are inaugurated, the community college is being identified clearly as higher education. Identification with the lower schools has deterred teachers who might otherwise thoroughly enjoy work in the community college. It has also led some graduate advisors to urge graduates to undertake teaching careers in more prestigious institutions, such as liberal arts colleges or universities.

There is also the problem of academic rank. The junior colleges are wrestling with recognition and promotion systems. Some have adopted the structure of academic rank but often allow it to operate quite differenly from the traditional rank systems. Others use methods of promotion which are related to professional training only. Others combine professional and other means of recognizing teaching merit short of the use of professional rank. Undoubtedly, this uncertainty about rank as a method of promotion deters some teachers from entering this field of service, and it renders difficult some transitions from junior college to senior college.

Salaries vary widely. Public statements have been made that teachers in California junior colleges are paid better salaries than those in the state colleges. In many other places, the community college salary schedules are very competitive in the marketplace of higher education. In smaller communities, however, the community college salary schedules may differ little from local high school schedules.

In some states, particularly those in which the community college retains a legal identification as secondary education, there is the obstacle of teacher certification. Many teachers who are interested in higher education find it difficult to face the problem of filing for certification.

The community college must aggressively seek candidates who have academic credentials and who have also gained experience in industry for teaching in the occupational curricula. Though this is a market which is not easily tapped, a few devices are productive. News stories which identify decisions to establish new kinds of curricula often fall into the hands of people who have an underlying interest in teaching. Community advisory committees can be helpful. Part-time lecturing can create interest. As more and more community colleges develop programs in occupational fields, and the universities help prepare candidates, the market for faculty in these occupational fields might become more regularized and recognized as one of the present channels for faculty in the academic disciplines.

In the December 1966 issue of *Journal of Higher Education*, C. Grey Austin, in an editorial entitled, "Recruiting College Teachers," points out that studies are now available which identify the kind of person likely to enter higher education as a career. He offers these suggestions:

> It will come as no surprise that those who become, or plan to become, faculty members usually report that their own college teachers have been the major factor in their choice of careers.
>
> The role of college teachers in the recruitment of their successors, central as it is, should be supported by the commitment of the college to the perpetuation of the academic species. The college which wishes to make more than a chance contribution to the future supply of college teachers might consider the following recommendations: (1) Systematically identify prospective college teachers in accord with the college's patterns of student life. (2) Facilitate relations between recruitable students and those faculty who are examples of college teaching at its best, through honors programs, student-organization advising, and so on. (3) Encourage, support, and maintain the continuity of those student organizations which serve intellectual and cultural purposes, and inhibit the success of those which do not. If fraternities, for example, fall in the latter category, then deferred rushing would be entirely appropriate. (4) Let undergraduates experience the satisfactions of college teaching by providing opportunities for them to serve as "junior faculty colleagues." (5) Furnish accurate information about college-teaching careers, graduate-study opportunities, and the availability of financial assistance early in the student's academic career.

Studies of community college faculties show that the typical member has come from a middle-class background. A significant number have been students at a junior or community college. Perhaps community colleges should cultivate the interest of students, give them opportunities to assist as tutors and teachers, and direct them to upper division and graduate programs which can return them to the two-year college as teachers. People who have had this experience show more sympathy and understanding of the special mission and philosophy of the community college. (Although we are only in our second year at Rock Valley College, we already have a number of excellent students who have developed an interest in teaching in the community college. This has been fostered by assistantships, tutorial center experience, and faculty interest.)

This can be noted especially in the occupational programs. The more able students who have completed courses in electronics, mechanical design, dental assisting, nursing, and other occupational programs can be encouraged to go on into degree and graduate programs which can include internship experience in the field and even a tour of employment to provide an enriched background for future teaching in the community college.

It would also be desirable to have junior college teachers have some opportunity to work in commerce, industry, and government in order that there can be a growth in mutual understanding between town and gown. Conversely, the local community college needs to cultivate liaison with business and industry through advisory committees, executive luncheons, and other means of communication to generate interest in the professional community in teaching service in the community college.

There are other great needs which can be met by the universities. Some English scholars estimate that 60 to 70 perecnt of all students learning writing at the college level will be taught in the community college as the universities narrow admissions doors. There is a critical need for the training programs for English teachers in written communication. The present graduate programs which are heavily oriented toward literature are not providing the kinds of experience needed by teachers who will be teaching writing and reading for young people and adults, some of whom are being given a second chance to continue personal development for a life of service in a complex, changing modern world.

The computer and instructional technology

LAUNOR F. CARTER

PART
VI
CHAPTER
13

THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS can be significantly changed by innovations in the technology of education. To understand new possibilities in instruction, we should also look at the broad system changes that will need to take place in educational institutions.

While the details of technological innovations for instruction in large institutions of higher education are unique to such settings, the general developments in educational technology will have a somewhat similar influence throughout the various levels of the educational community. I shall review a number of developments as they are now occurring in many settings. My major emphasis will be on the applications and impact of computers and modern data processing.

I feel confident that as a new generation of professional educators assumes responsibility in the schools and as school boards change their composition, we will see an acceptance and welcoming of technology in education. That time is not far off. I feel confident that information processing and the use of the computer will have a profound impact. This impact will probably make itself felt in the following sequence:

1. First will be the use of computers for research and computational assistance in universities. The National Science Foundation has just issued a report showing the sizable investment in university computer centers.

2. Many institutions of higher education and a sizable sprinkling of secondary schools now use computers for logistic and accounting purposes. They are used also for registration, class scheduling, and grade reporting. Routine personnel functions are becoming computerized. It will not be long until every large educational establishment either has its own computer or has access to one through time-sharing.

3. As professors, secondary school teachers, and school administrators become accustomed to the computer, they will accept more and more intimate involvement of the computer in the educational process itself. Soon student counseling for scheduling and advisement purposes will be largely computer-based. Much counseling is routine, and the computer is more effective at routine tasks than people are. Counselors will have their time freed for the student with unusual counseling needs of an advisory or emotional character.

4. Finally, computer-aided instruction will come into its own. When this

happens, many other educational practices will be affected: graded classes, age-placement practices, student-teacher relationships, facility use, etc. Because so many facets of school practice will be influenced by computer-aided instruction, it will be slow in coming to maturity; but I confidently predict that in the next twenty years computer-aided instruction will have a greater impact in education than will all the other uses previously discussed.

The day is not far off when every respectable institution of higher education will have a computer center as naturally as it has a library. The computer center will not be a facility used by a few research professors and advanced students, but will be used by practically every student and staff member. Within the year some 80 percent of the undergraduates at Dartmouth will know an elementary programing language called BASIC and be using the computer center as a part of their instructional program.

Recently, J. Barkley Rosser and an NAS-NRC committee issued a report on the digital computer needs in universities and colleges. He reports that in 1965 there were 801 digital computers at 289 colleges and universities with a capital value of $330 million. The committee recommended that the federal government increase its support of university computer centers, and suggested that "the 1964 campus computing capacity should be doubled by 1968. By doubling capacity we mean doubling annual campus computing budgets. To help accomplish this end, the federal share should rise from $65 million in fiscal 1964 to about $180 million in fiscal 1968." The report goes on to estimate that by 1968 the annual campus computer expense will be $300 million. In spite of the magnitude of these recommendations, many persons most familiar with the growing use of data processing believe the recommended sums will fall significantly short of the demand.

So far, the computer has had its greatest impact on instruction in mathematics and the sciences. It is important to note that computer and information science has become a recognized subject for major concentration at a number of universities. But soon all students in mathematics and the sciences, in engineering, in the life sciences, in the social sciences, and in linguistics will be using the computer as routinely as they now use the library. Even in the humanities and the arts we see research reports based on computer analyses. As the day comes when it becomes as easy for the student to use the computer as to use the library, we can confidently expect that professors will start using the resources of the computer for instruction just as they now assign work in the library.

When most of us think of the application of computers in education, we think of computer-assisted instruction, and yet this will probably be one of the last applications as far as mass adoption is concerned. Not only is it expensive, but it offers a direct challenge to the teacher in his traditional role. Nevertheless, it is this area which, in the long run, promises the greatest rewards and deserves serious study.

A substantial number of studies have been completed in our System Development Corporation laboratory. One of the first things that become apparent was that the potential advantage of computer-assisted instruction was limited by the quality of the instructional material. It is a comparatively simple electronic task to branch a student having trouble to remedial material. It is quite another thing to design remedial selections that will correct his difficulty. For this reason, much of the work has emphasized research on the design of sound instructional material. In our studies we have compared different response modes, different frame designs, different learning reinforcement procedures, different teacher roles, and different sequencing methods.

These formal experiments often yielded statistically significant but practically unimportant results. The results convinced us that branching was important but that, by all odds, the most important determinant of effective learning was the quality of the teaching material itself. Unless the basic teaching material had been tried out by a technique we have called "the engineering approach," it usually proved to be ineffective. To present the fundamental idea and the evidence on which it is based, I quote at length from a paper Harry Silberman and I published recently (Educational Testing Service, 1965):

"Before the influence of seemingly potent variables can be observed, highly effective materials must be developed. It became apparent that effective materials are not produced by *a priori* hypothesis-testing experiments. Something that might be called tutorial engineering is required. We have obtained some evidence for this point of view from a recent tutorial study in which an iterative empirical procedure was used to produce segments of effective instructional material. The purpose of this research was to generate a set of hypotheses about how to improve instructional materials. This work began with the selection and development of seemingly high-quality initial versions of self-instructional programs in reading, arithmetic, geometry, and Spanish. A series of successive experimental revisions was made to each segment of these materials. Progressively improved versions were then developed until the desired standards of performance were achieved.

"For each program a tutorial procedure was used to determine what changes should be made in the material. A set of teaching material was tried with one child at a time. If in the judgment of the experimenter the child was making a sufficient number of errors to warrant assistance, his progress through the items was halted. The experimenter then tried to determine the source of the difficulty and to remedy it by a variety of tutorial techniques. When the child resolved his difficulty, the experimenter recorded the program variation that seemed effective. This process of tutorial modification was continued until a sufficient number of tutorial changes were recorded to warrant a major revision to the material. The revised version of the program was then tried on other children. Subsequent revisions were made in the same manner.

"The data were then analyzed for consistencies and patterns. The analysis resulted in hypotheses concerning modifications which accounted for the improvement in the programs. Three hypotheses about how to improve materials were common to all four programs. These were called the gap hypothesis, the irrelevancy hypothesis, and the mastery hypothesis.

"The *gap hypothesis* refers to the explicit inclusion in the program of items that cover all of the criterion skills. That is, once a set of objectives and a test of those objectives have been prepared, the program should include items that cover every skill required in the test and every skill prerequisite to the criterion performance. . . .

"The *irrelevancy hypothesis* refers to the desirability of eliminating items that are unrelated to questions contained in the criterion test. We found it was a good idea to restrain our tendency to add something extra to a program because it just seemed like a good idea . . . .

"The *mastery hypothesis* refers to the requirement that the student not be permitted to move on to subsequent topics until he had mastered the present one . . . .

"An independent experiment was conducted with a different set of materials and new students to test these three hypotheses. The hypotheses had originally been observed in the course of making improvements to four sets of material. The new experiment validated these findings by reversing the process. It was shown that if the same improvements are taken out of effective programs, there will be a corresponding performance decrement . . . .

"This tutorial study has convinced us that the technique of successive empirical iteration of each segment of a set of instructional material, until specified objectives are achieved, provides a powerful method both for generating potent hypotheses and for developing effective instructional material. This is quite different from the more conventional procedure of building a complete instructional package before evaluating it. The conventional get-the-whole-job-done-at-once method has been used by many authors but it has seldom resulted in a product that works very effectively. In short, this research on methods of designing instructional materials has resulted in an empirical and pragmatic technique which may be applied to the development of complete courses. The technique leads to an instructional product that will establish specified skills and competencies in the student."

We are now applying the techniques we have developed to the teaching of statistical inference. The statistical inference program, which is being conducted in conjunction with the Department of Psychology and the School of Education at UCLA, is designed to improve teaching of this subject to future research workers in education. The teacher prepares the students in prerequisite topics such as probability, descriptive statistics, and the use of the computer as a statistical tool. The students are also given assignments in associated reading material. When these prerequisite assignments are satisfactorily completed, the students then begin to work independently with the computer. The students at UCLA use the System Development Corporation programed materials at remote student stations—teletypewriters located on campus that communicate with the central computer at our headquarters in Santa Monica.

This remote time-sharing capability is most important to the general feasibility of computer-assisted instruction. If automated methods are ever to be implemented on a wide scale, the most economical method promises to be time-sharing systems by which individual schools can have easy access to central computer complexes through remote stations.

The student working on the statistical inference program with the computer receives a graded sequence of statistical problems. For example, he may be given a problem in which he must apply the proper statistical tests to determine whether two methods of instruction differ in effectiveness. In response to a query the computer will present, via teletype printout, the samples of data for the two groups. The data can be either prestored or generated to represent given population characteristics. The student must choose an appropriate technique for testing the hypothesis that the two groups of data were from the same population. He may simply use the computer as a desk calculator, or he may select from a library of statistical routines to have the computation done automatically. If he is having difficulty, he can call in a question-answering routine. He may then ask his questions by typing in natural language, e.g., "How do I calculate a standard deviation?" or "What is meant by confidence interval?" and will receive typed-out English answers to his questions.

A diagnostic routine is also available which will branch the student who is having difficulty to remedial material or to appropriate pages in his reading material. After the student enters his analysis of the problem, the computer will then solve the problem, using the technique recommended by the instructor, and will compare the instructor's solution with the student's. The student will then be presented with information describing the actual population and with an evaluation of his solution. Subsequent directions for the solution of that problem or the next problem in the series will then be presented.

As students become proficient at choosing appropriate techniques for estimating population parameters from sample data and in testing hypotheses, they will be given instructional material covering a special computer language which is designed to enable the nonprogramer to readily acquire computer programing skill. The students will then be scheduled on the machine to code and check out their own computer programs to perform statistical computations.

In building the material for this statistical inference course, we wanted to be able to build instructional materials easily, try them out immediately, and then revise them. To do this, we have developed a new tool to assist the course designer called PLANIT, (*P*rograming *LAN*guage for *I*nteractive *T*eaching). This user-oriented programing language was designed by members of the Technology Directorate's Education and Training staff (Sam Feingold and Chuck Frye) and was developed in connection with an NSF-sponsored project on Computer-Based Instruction in Statistical Inference. Originated for the design of programed mathematics instruction sequences, it soon became evident that PLANIT had much broader applicability: it is valuable in building many kinds of programed instruction and can be adapted for computer-assisted counseling as well as for administrative planning.

Aside from its versatility, its most attractive feature is its simplicity from the user's standpoint. PLANIT offers teacher, student, and administrator direct and eåsy access to the computer: a first-time user can build a programed lesson sequence on line at a remote teletype, learning the system as he goes. He need only consult an instruction sheet which describes briefly certain options and outlines the use of conventions such as the asterisk and a set of four special commands.

The PLANIT system is presently being converted for operation with the IBM 360. Conversion to other machines will depend on what computer configuration seems to be gaining widest acceptance. And here the sophistication of the system imposes a caveat: for some time to come, modifications for other computers and adaptation to school district or regional needs will probably have to be performed by the designers of the system or by others equally familiar with it. Many organizations are developing systems of computer-assisted instruction and undoubtedly they will be vigorously marketed. With this thought, let us turn to some of the problems associated with these innovations.

Associated with the promise of this new technology for improving our educational system is a series of compelling problems which may slow down the application of technology. Indeed, the education system has considerable inertia; technological change must be regarded not as a revolutionary process but as an evolutionary one. One problem is the well-intentioned resistance to the introduction of technology into the educational process that stems from concern that it will dehumanize a very human process.

What is often overlooked is that the human quality and the genuine personal touch are often lost *without* automation. Technology will assist and support many education functions, thus increasing the productivity of the teaching force and freeing them of the multitude of clerical, record-keeping chores and the elementary task of simply presenting information for student consumption. This can restore the personal touch to the education process.

Another major problem is the difficulty in getting educational research applied. The traditional assumption is that there is a fairly smooth sequence from research through a developmental phase to the utilization of results. More and more evidence shows that this sequence is very seldom followed in actual practice, and that special efforts must be made to ensure that the results of research or new developments are carried through to application in a school setting. We have begun to realize the special importance of the innovator and leader in the transition from research to application.

Another area critical to the application of new knowledge has to do with communication. The formal publication of new findings does not by any means ensure that the results will be expeditiously translated into a useful educational development. Rather, the indications are that informal communication is, by all odds, the most important method or technique for transmitting ideas from one environment into a different one.

Perhaps more important, however, is the requirement that innovations be given credible demonstrations in the sense that they must be demonstrations in the school setting, carried out by regular personnel and not by specialists who come into the school situation and then leave.

The federal legislation establishing the Regional Educational Laboratories may have been one of the most significant educational advances because it helps ensure a proper development and demonstration of the credibility of educational innovations.

Another problem which may retard the application of technology is reflected in the concern of educators about the increasing participation in education by product-oriented industry. There has been concern in the past about the fact that the textbook a publisher produces for school use can be a strong determinant of what students end up studying. The marketing of a host of new teaching devices and other educational materials has renewed the fear that commercial competition will influence educational objectives, policies, and the content of specific courses. Unfortunately, much of the new material on the market is inadequately tested. We cannot expect commercial publishers or manufacturers to produce thoroughly tested materials, since they work in a competitive environment and their retail prices must absorb all the costs of development and testing. Often selection authorities use subjective criteria in choosing new material. Until objective evaluations are demanded, training material which proves unsatisfactory after use will continue to be a problem and may improperly retard technical development.

Most of us have not faced up to the question of costs. Education is a $50 billion business, but the addition of significant new costs must be justified in terms of reduced costs in other areas, or by clearly improved quality of training. At SDC we are now undertaking a study of the costs/benefits factors related to introducing computer-based systems in public schools.

PART VII

JOINING FORCES

Leadership: organization and structure

PART VII CHAPTER 1

MARTIN TARCHER

IN 1930 THAT MOST MISINTERPRETED and misapplied of all philosophers, John Dewey, wrote:

> Our schooling largely evades serious consideration of the deeper issues of social life . . . the effective education, that which really leaves a stamp on character and thought, is obtained when graduates come to take their part in the activities of an adult society which puts exaggerated emphasis upon business and the results of business success. (*Individualism, Old and New*. New York, N.Y.: Minton and Balch.)

Dewey was criticizing a social philosophy which was geared to a world of scarcity. It was a world in which man's most urgent drive was to gratify basic material needs—to solve problems relating to the allocation of scarce material resources and to the production and distribution of material goods and resources. In such a social setting man learned to value productivity and the specialization that so increased productive efficiency. Unlimited wants and scarce means were accepted as the basic givens of economic principles and practice. Self-interest, in terms of gratifying material wants, became the major motivating force of human behavior. We adhered to "natural laws" and the laws of the "free" market, without which we believed there could be no freedom. Thus we came to see freedom as the absence or the minimum of government interference. And individualism, the exercise of freedom, became the desire and ability to compete. "Natural rights," particularly property rights, were viewed as more important than social responsibility and service to the community. Value we equated with price, and we learned to bestow higher rewards upon the manipulators of money than upon the teachers of our children. Power we recognized as superior to understanding. And the clash of vested interests in political and economic marketplaces we came to accept as the best means of determining social policy.

The 1930's were years of depression and want. Dewey was perhaps unrealistic or premature in depreciating the importance of productivity and the drive toward material goals. And perhaps it was necessary for the schools to produce graduates with the skills and attitudes required for survival and the struggle against scarcity. One might well argue that the materialistic values constituted major parts of a social philosophy which was very much in tune with the realities of the time.

But now the realities are changing. We are the first society in the history of mankind to reach the edge of abundance. With our unprecedented explosion in scientific and technological knowhow; with new frontiers of space and sea; with computers, still in the Model T stage, adding brainpower to the muscle capabilities of the machine and promising a cornucopia of goods and services; with the Keynesian tools of fiscal and monetary policy which, although imperfect, are a mighty advance towards economic growth and stability—we begin to realize that technologically, at least, we have the means for a massive and final assault against poverty and its culture, at home and abroad. We have the technology but we lack the social organization, the innovation of ideas. There are no limits on *how much* we can produce, but we appear unable to determine what is worth producing, and how to distribute equitably the fruits of our industry. Nor have we created the activities—call them work, leisure, or what you will—which develop creators rather than consumers, participants rather than spectators, doers whose doing is based on valid theory rather than thinkers who never do or doers who never think. Although they have been greatly modified, the values and assumptions of the world of scarcity are still very much accepted and applied by our political, economic, and social decision-makers. What is worse is that they are still accepted and perpetuated by most of the educators in most of our institutions of higher learning. The times call for new social goals, new values and assumptions, new institutional arrangements that will allow us to complete our unfinished war against scarcity and move beyond production to the development of human potentialities.

The intellectual leadership required for our social reconstruction will not come from the Pentagon, Capitol Hill, the business community, the labor movement, or from public, private, and voluntary agencies. These decision-makers are busily engaged in countless brush wars and minor skirmishes against the symptoms of social problems. They are activists, unconcerned with theory. And they fail to realize that they are applying the tired theories of defunct economists and philosophers to problems that will have to be explained by new theories, attacked through new social institutions. The leadership will come when our colleges and universities—which are or should be concerned with theory—turn their unique resources and innovative capabilities to the tasks of social reconstruction. Unfortunately, we in education are caught up in the very web of values and assumptions that it is our responsibility to review, in the social arrangements that it is our responsibility to change. Our reconstruction, then, must begin in the schools themselves. And the time has come to ask what changes are required in the structure and organization of our colleges and universities. Clearly this is a question that has no simple, single answer. It must be approached through the thoughts, experiments, and actions of all educators concerned with the future of man.

I would like to suggest one idea that I hope will prove worthy of consideration and experimentation. It is based upon three assumptions. The first is that higher education is largely irrelevant unless it performs its function as society's instrument for continuous, constructive self-criticism and social change. The second is that higher education should help students to gain a theoretical framework of values and ideas, and scientific habits of thought and action—so that as future entrepreneurs, legislators, scientists, and educators they may better understand, control, and improve their natural-social environments. The third is that schools will perform neither of these functions until they become integrative rather than fragmenting; until we eliminate the narrow, restrictive, disciplinary boundaries.

I recently attended the annual meeting of the American Economics Association. In the informal hallway sessions, the names of economist critics of economic theory cropped up constantly. "Galbraith, Theobald, Boulding? They're not economists, they're social philosophers," was the frequent comment, always spoken with opprobrium. And of course, the speakers, the specialists in monetary or fiscal policy, shipping procedures, econometrics, and GNP accounting, were correct. For the subjects of their remarks are indeed social philosophers. But what kind of social scientist is an economist, political scientist, sociologist, or psychologist who is not also a social philosopher? He is bound to be a narrowly overspecialized technician, a mechanic who, to use an old cliché, knows more and more about less and less. This is not a plea for the end of specialization, but for the end of narrow specialization. We need specialists who are broad-gauged, who see the data and theory of their discipline within the broader context of our natural-social realities; who know how to relate verifiable evidence from other disciplines to their own areas of competency; and who, because of this extension into related subjects, constantly improve their own comprehension and capabilities.

There is no knowledge without understanding of relationships. And the relationships we wish to understand are those between man and nature, man and man in his natural and social settings. No meaningful relationships or problems, however, are so obliging as to fall graciously within the limits or boundaries of any single discipline. As long as we ignore the comprehensiveness of all things, as long as we continue to divide our institutions into clearly defined and delimited departments and cram each department with sharply defined and delimited specialties within specialties, we shall continue to graduate men and women who accept rather than question old values and assumptions—who are alienated from the realities of their time. It is an unusual student who can, without direction from his teachers, tie fragments of knowledge into a meaningful whole—into a framework for understanding his community, his nation, his world. Perhaps we can eliminate such fragmentation by building areas of our curricula, especially at the undergraduate level, not around disciplines but around questions and problems. "What is the nature of our natural and social environment? How have we organized ourselves to meet specific social needs, and what values, beliefs, and attitudes underlie these institutional arrangements? What are the forces presently at work—the trends and developments effecting change? What are the problems, the opportunities and challenges created by these developments? What alternatives for action are open to us, and what are the likely consequences of each alternative?"

I hope and expect that the institution of the future will have learned that both the best teaching and the best learning occur in the course of research involvement. By research, however, I do not mean opinion surveys, participant observation, or any other technique which limits itself to the accumulation and classification of data—the description of what is. I am referring to scientific method, to laboratory experimentation in which scientists ask questions; select a problem; obtain, analyze, and evaluate data; predict the consequences of data changes; choose a course of action; and use symbolic tools to simulate actual conditions and test the selection made. This is a method not of description, but of change. In this laboratory environment small groups of students with similar educational aims and backgrounds could be apprenticed to small groups of faculty with related but varied specialties. Together, students and faculty would attempt to solve the real problems of real environments, both natural and social—wherever possible linking the two. The students, working as scientists with scientists, would have a voice in the selection of a project. Let us take an illustration.

Consider a research problem for budding social scientists. A group could assume the role of legislators in an actual American city. The task would be to legislate social improvement, overcoming whatever opposition and obstacles might appear. To begin, the group would necessarily apply itself to the first question around which our curriculum is based. "What is our environment, our community, like?" The students would find that a study of this community requires not a detailed knowledge of any one discipline, but an understanding of social institutions. How, for example, is this community organized to allocate its resources and produce and distribute goods and services? How does it maintain law and order and effect change? What arrangements does this community make for educating its young? Where have these and other social institutions been effective and where are they breaking down? From here the group moves to our next curriculum question. "Why are the social arrangements as they are? What are the historical circumstances behind their formation? Under what values and assumptions were the people operating who were responsible for the creation of such institutions? Are the assumptions still valid?" And so to the third curriculum question. "What are the forces presently at work—the trends and developments affecting change?" Here the group is confronted with the effects upon the community of cybernation and automation, of decisions made by the Common Market in Europe, of national economic policies, of the gain or loss of a defense contract, of a movement to the city of poor farmers or southern Negroes in search of a better life.

Once they recognize and understand the forces operating to change our city, the group can move on the fourth curriculum question. "What are the problems, the opportunities, and the challenges created by these developments?" In attempting to answer this last question, the group cannot long remain aloof from the human condition. For they are no longer dealing with egos, ids, and superegos, but with human beings whose usefulness is seemingly destroyed by new machines, with people caught up by forces they can neither understand nor control. Finally they can consider such questions as "What alternatives of action are open to us as legislators? What bills should we try to pass? What would be the likely consequences if our bills became law? What new potential problems can we anticipate and what additional legislation could prevent these problems or modify their effects? What legislation, in other words, will allow us to make maximum use of our technology and our resources, and help us to design institutions which will improve the quality of our lives?"

The method need not be limited to the social sciences. Why, for example, cannot a group of students and scientists in the health and medical field take as a research problem the improvement of medical and health facilities in an actual village in India, or in a ghetto of an urban center in the United States? Following the same procedures as we have outlined, they could learn much about the relationship between the physical sciences and the social environment. And much data and theory could be made available by our institutions of higher learning to decision-makers, to those responsible for health and medicine in the villages and ghettos of the world.

This educational approach would not allow the students to go off in all directions. Faculty still has the major responsibility of introducing or directing the students, at the appropriate times, to the *essential* data and theory from each of the disciplines involved. A theoretical framework must be developed, a framework which expands as new data and theory are introduced. The students work with the theory, use it, link it to what they already know, and apply it to the problems of their community. They relate theory to practice, concentrate on connections, and develop that most important habit of the learning process—the ability to place objects and events in new relationships. In the course of studying and analyzing the community, the student also becomes familiar with such tools for obtaining data as statistical skills. But in learning statistical theory, for example, he will not be dealing with the subject in the abstract. He will apply the theory immediately and directly to obtaining and evaluating data referring specifically to the community under study. Similarly, opinion research techniques might be taught through the designing of an actual survey to be taken in the community.

In attacking problems through this research method, students get new data; make, discover, learn from, and correct mistakes; bring to light new problems; and disclose gaps in present knowledge. When they achieve their end—draw their conclusions or solve their problem—all this new knowledge becomes part of the means to new ends. In analyzing the meaning of their accomplishment, in going over all they have learned, the students and faculty will think in terms of the next step. "Where do we go from here? What is the next problem we should attempt to solve? How can our new knowledge be of value in defining and attacking our new problem?" Thus, the group moves from problem to problem, bringing in faculty from other disciplines as needed. The theoretical framework is systematically expanded. And without such a framework, all the facts in the universe will not help the student to understand that universe.

Learning through research involvement of this type is certainly more exciting than the passive absorption of facts and ideas as disseminated, in lectures or discussion, by teachers anxious to get back to their research. This is not intended to imply that every subject or area of study can or should be taught in this manner. Nor does it mean that the research participants will not attend lectures, take part in discussions, use learning machines, or read books. It does mean that the year's reading, writing, listening, and discussing will be purposive. It will be directed towards the solution of specific problems. It will be preparation for research activities—means to the data and ideas pertinent to the student's project. Finally, such projects are the beginning, not the end of learning. They provide the breadth and scope necessary for the student to become broad-gauged *before* he becomes a specialist. And when the time arrives for him to select his area of specialization, he will be able to draw upon an experience which involved him in the material and meaning of many disciplines.

When this method is applied in the schools, the nature of the projects —the disciplines included and the ease or difficulty of the problems to be solved—would depend upon the goals and upon the prior education and experience of the students. Undoubtedly, problems of a more technical nature would be the basis for programing in the two-year community colleges. This does not mean vocational training as we know it. In our changing society the only skills that will not quickly become obsolete are the skills of learning themselves. The subject matter will differ in community colleges, colleges, and universities. But the projects will have things in common. They will provide a framework for understanding the nature of man and his environment. They will emphasize the communication skills necessary for research. And they will attempt to develop a scientific approach to experience, scientific habits of thought and action.

There are, I believe, many advantages to be gained through this approach. First, it cuts down the artificial and destructive barrier we have built between teaching and research. Faculty will view students not as killers of their more important and more profitable research time, but as apprentices who can contribute significantly to research. Students will learn not through absorption and regurgitation, but in the way scientists have always learned—in the process, the act of discovery itself. And students will have no cause for complaints about not getting to see, know, or work with faculty. It is probable too that students, who are still young enough to avoid complacency, will keep faculty close to the problems, the realities, the relevancies of the real world.

The second advantage is that faculty will be forced to broaden its scope. No longer will it be possible for specialists to limit their reading and talking solely to their own alter egos, and to repeat continuously the same errors. It is easy for a narrow specialist to maintain his myth of value neutrality when his only serious intellectual contacts share his discipline, his values, and his myth. But when the same specialist must work with faculty from other disciplines, it is not likely that he will long go unchallenged. The unlimited wants, the material self-interest, and the narrow concept of freedom of our economist, for example, will not easily slip by the anthropologist or psychologist who might see man not as an accumulator, but as a being whose self-interest lies in a struggle for identity, in an attempt to learn and to fulfill his creative potentialities.

The third advantage of our method is that it develops a sense of community. Administrators, faculty, and students become participating members rather than managers, employees, and products of the bureaucratic organization. No matter how large the school, the method narrows it down to small, manageable groups of individuals, working cooperatively and sharing common goals. Gone is the impersonality of the multiversity. The participants all share a role in the determination of purpose, content, and method. The students help to select the problems to be solved. And they share the responsibility for the tasks that lie ahead. Their community, however, is not the community of a monastic order. The school takes its problems and its data from the broader community. In turn, it gives the community that which only higher education can give—valid theory to direct the course of social action. In other words, the school becomes relevant. It stops fiddling while society writhes. It becomes the source of our needed social reconstruction.

One can correctly point out that educators are very much involved in the community today—that as consultants to government, business, and labor and through their research efforts, they make major contributions to social action. True, but they are not their own masters. It is their employers or grantors who ask the questions and decide what problems are to be solved. Generally, these employers seek competitive advantage rather than criticism. Whether the purpose of the assignment is to produce a better missile, test a better pill, make workers happy so that they will produce more, outsell Product *X*, or design an improved pension plan, it is to do better that which is already being done. Thus, our consultants are in the service of the existing institutional arrangements, of the status quo. They are not our specialists in constructive criticism and social change.

We arrive at the fourth and last advantage. The method helps the student to develop commitment to society and to social goals. It is therefore an attack upon that malignancy which plagues modern man—the boredom and cynicism which we call alienation. The theories of alienation are legion and pervade the pages of social criticism. Nor has the theme been missed by the humanities. Wherever there is literature, art, or the mass media, there can be found the lonely, pathetic, apathetic, alienated man—be he dropout, hippie, alcoholic, addict, Hell's Angel, or clean-shaven businessman or college professor who wonders why, with all his success, he is bugged by guilt, dissatisfaction, a feeling that he is somehow without feeling. Certainly when one is at a loss to understand his environment—when he is the object, not the subject, of change—when he is buffeted by events he can neither comprehend nor control—he will be alienated. The method, by getting the student to doubt, question, and test; by introducing him to risk and experimentation; by giving him authority as well as responsibility; by providing the opportunity for sharing purposes and efforts with others; and by posing for his consideration not a jungle of isolated courses and facts and unrelated texts, but the real problems of real people in real communities helps him to develop the values and theory for understanding his environment and becoming a self-directing citizen.

The approach I have attempted to describe has been tried, with, I believe, some success—admittedly on a very modest scale. It is clear that I have left many questions unanswered and many details to be worked out. There is room for much improvement, improvement that I hope many educators will make. Perhaps the most important criticism that can be leveled against the method has already been made by E. M. Hutchinson who, in reviewing the book, *Leadership and the Power of Ideas,* in which I expounded the approach stated, "One doubts whether even the most affluent society could generalize such a training method in a foreseeable future and to that extent it was an abstraction from reality."

In response to this criticism, I must first reiterate that the approach is not proposed as a panacea, but rather as one method to be tested and improved along with many others. More important, I believe that what appears idealistic today may well prove to be very realistic in the near future. Our danger lies not in being idealistic, but in underestimating the fantastic potentialities of our science and technology. There is no future for timidity or negativism in education. We can no longer afford either the mentality or the institutions of the age of scarcity. Industry has already begun to recognize that the future lies in education and the development of brainpower. The corporation invests in research and development; moves into the mass media; purchases or merges with publishing and textbook companies; and obtains substantial contracts for operating Job Corps centers, poverty programs, and training programs and for trying to solve social problems we in education too frequently ignore. The business community anticipates the day when total or partial disarmament will call for vast expenditures to be invested in education—and it makes its plans.

If educators are to control the purposes, the content, and the methods of that education, we must be bold, imaginative, and experimental. We must prepare now for the time when education is recognized as America's greatest growth industry in the best sense of the term; when we will support it as we have conquered scarcity, and can move on to our next task—the development of humanhood; when the thing becomes secondary and the end is man.

Interinstitutional cooperation

RAYMOND S. MOORE

PART
VII
CHAPTER
2

ALTHOUGH AMERICAN BUSINESS BEGAN a serious courtship of the cooperative nearly fifty years ago, higher education is just now developing such a wholehearted attachment. There has, of course, been some cooperation in business through the centuries, and higher education has experimented in a limited way for more than two millenia. Yet through most of these years both business and higher education have treated the cooperative much like a pretty girl who lives in the slums, her virtue unfairly suspect because she comes from the other side of the tracks.

But cooperation has waited, certain that her true qualities would some time be known. And today the best of American higher institutions are leading the suitors to her door. In a study we recently completed at the U.S. Office of Education, we developed details on well over 1,300 consortia of colleges and universities in the United States. These do not include such standard internships and affiliations as are indispensable to medicine and teacher education. Nor do they bracket that large group of bilaterals in which one American college or university cooperates with a single school overseas.

The figure of 1,300, however, is unquestionably conservative. There may well be a thousand more. For American colleges and universities showed an average awareness of only about 30 percent of their cooperative arrangements, even though 91 percent of them responded to the study. In fact, if bilateral consortia are excluded, the awareness quotient drops to about 20 percent, for that is the percentage of schools involved in multilateral partnerships (three or more institutions) which actually reported those mechanisms.

Nearly all educators interviewed, and I too, thought there would be fewer than 400 consortia in the United States. Yet the almost infinite possibilities for interinstitutional cooperation revealed by the survey make one wonder why the figure was not 4,000. Apparently higher education has been caught in a plethora of suspicions, fears, misinformation, and lack of information much as business and agriculture were in the years following World War I. It remained for sometime scholar, geologist, economist, and commonsense man Herbert Hoover, writing in 1922, to relieve fears and to clarify the purposes and principles of the cooperative process. He speaks to business, but note how implicit his remarks are for higher education.

> Today business organization is moving strongly toward cooperation. There are in the cooperative great hopes that we can even gain in individuality, equality of

> opportunity, and an enlarged field for initiative, and at the same time reduce many of the great wastes of over-reckless competition in production and distribution. Those who either congratulate themselves or those who fear that cooperation is an advance toward socialism need neither rejoice nor worry. Cooperation in its current economic sense represents the initiative of self-interest blended with a sense of service, for nobody belongs to a cooperative who is not striving to sell his products or services for more or striving to buy from others for less or striving to make his income more secure. . . . Their only success lies where they eliminate waste either in production or distribution—and they can do neither if they destroy individual initiative. Indeed, this phase of development of our individualism promises to become the dominant note of its twentieth-century expansion. But it will thrive only insofar as it can construct leadership and a sense of service, and so long as it preserves the initiative and safeguards the individuality of its members. (*American Individualism,* New York, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1922.)

Note the combination of altruism and self-preservation in President Hoover's conditions for success; his emphasis on initiative and individuality for the members of the true cooperative in business. Observe his concern for unnecessary waste in "over-reckless competition." These are precisely the kinds of guidelines turned up in our study of cooperation in higher education.

Raymond Miller, a world authority on cooperatives, carries Mr. Hoover's analysis a bit further and distinguishes between the coöperative and the cartel:

> Cooperatives are catalysts, which because of member participation, understanding, and experience, help make possible the development of a competitive, capitalistic economy with individual economic, political, judicial, and social liberties.
>
> Cartels, monopolistic-exploitative capitalism produce the cataclysm, which, because of individual frustration thus created, makes probable the ascendancy of dictatorial communism. This, in turn, destroys or makes impossible competitive, capitalistic enterprise and economic, political, judicial and social liberties. (*A Conservative Looks at Cooperatives.* Columbus, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1964.)

Successful cooperative arrangements in higher education today have certain common characteristics. These include a genuine mutuality in participation and experience. They, like business coöperatives, find that cooperation enhances an institution's competitive position and strengthens confidence in terms of student and faculty retention and the respect of other schools.

There are many educators, however, both administrative and faculty, who impute to educational consortia the characteristics of the cartel. Such biases and misinformation breed suspicions about the intent of other colleges and universities; fears of loss of students, faculty, prestige; or autonomy or competitive position. This, and the *lack* of information among many, unquestionably account to some extent for the slow headway which cooperation has made in higher education. But the picture is changing. Not only are many colleges and universities alert to burgeoning enrollments and the pressures of unprecedented advances in knowledge, but they also are opening their eyes to societal challenges which have long been with us, but are now becoming imperatives. Social, political, and cultural mandates place institutions in a position where they must work together in order to provide truly creative programs. In other words, the time has come when they must cooperate in order to compete.

Not only is the cooperative process conserving staff and facilities and in many cases saving substantial money, but it is also making possible the operation of highly sophisticated facilities (such as the National Laboratories) and esoteric programs which no one school could adequately handle; nor could one school alone accrue optimum benefit. So well received are cooperative arrangements, in fact, that member institutions judged nearly 94 percent of them worthwhile. And less than 1 percent of the existing partnerships were considered unsuccessful. Even most of the 33 discontinued consortia were appraised worthwhile.

Almost half—49.8 percent—of these consortia receive no extra-institutional support. Of the half that do receive outside support, by far the great majority benefit from private rather than federal support. Among the more than 300 arrangements now well along in the planning stage, however, the demand for federal funds is on the rise: nearly two and a half times as many planned mechanisms are expecting such public money as those now existing.

One of the paradoxes in the cooperation picture is the fact that those institutions which need it most are participating the least. Nearly 500 colleges, including a few universities, indicated no interest. One pointed out that it was already an excellent school, that it had a Phi Beta Kappa chapter. Some begged geographic isolation as a reason. These and other rationales demonstrated a provincialism or a lack of information about interinstitutional cooperation which prevails to a greater or lesser degree in virtually all schools.

Sometimes administrators are alert to cooperation's benefits and their faculties know little or nothing about it. Often this is reversed. In most cases, the view of cooperation is limited pretty much to that in which the institution is involved, or to a few well-publicized cooperatives. Relatively few colleges and universities, for example, are aware of the benefits available to them through the National Laboratories at Argonne, Brookhaven, and Oak Ridge; or the Smithsonian Institution; or the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. The Laboratories and Woods Hole welcome qualified students and faculty on varying bases from any school. The Smithsonian presently has more than seventy graduate students working in a variety of disciplines for a wide range of institutions. Hundreds of institutions are joined in profitable bilateral arrangements which strengthen both the guest and the host. Duke University, for example, has at least sixty-five separate partnerships in forestry. Columbia has many in engineering, Drew in its United Nations program, and American University shares its Washington Semester with more than a hundred.

Although we shy away from categorizing consortia lest we limit perspective, there are at least six major classifications, some of them with subdivisions:

1. The *single bilateral* may be a simple one like the Rutgers-Monmouth arrangement in business administration, or complex like that of North Texas State and Texas Women's Universities, which cuts across many disciplines.

2. The *fraternal bilateral* usually covers only one discipline, but finds more than one institution involved in separate but similar programs with a central school. Duke's program in forestry is an example.

3. The *federation of bilaterals* is actually a multilateral. It is similar to the fraternal bilateral except that the lateral or guest schools join in common planning with the central school, as with American University in its Washington Semester.

4. The *multilateral* includes three or more institutions and may be (a) simple and centered, such as the National Center for Atmospheric Research, which concentrates on one broad disciplinary area with a center in Boulder, Colorado; (b) simple and dispersed, like the cooperative Ph.D. in classical civilization of the Universities of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin whose center changes yearly in a shift of administration from school to school; (c) complex and centered, such as the CIC or the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area; or (d) complex and dispersed, like the Connecticut Valley Consortium, which may be administered from Amherst, Holyoke, Smith, or the University of Massachusetts.

5. The *college or university center* may be bilateral or multilateral, but has a definite academic center most often used by geographically contiguous campuses or by institutions within daily commuting distance.

6. The *constellation of consortia* finds two or more consortia involved in partnership with a teaching, research, and/or service center or program or central consortium. The Argonne National Laboratory is an excellent example, with seven participating consortia totaling more than 100 institutions in addition to a number of bilaterals.

Consortia often have *satellites* such as the Great Lakes Colleges Association's agreements with the University of Miami and with Nebraska Wesleyan to share its humanities program in Bogotá, Colombia. And some consortia have *sponsors*, particularly during such developmental periods as the College Center of the Finger Lakes is now experiencing with help from Syracuse University.

There are also categories of function including (a) the academic areas; (b) the administrative arena with cooperative administration which involves everything from fund-raising and recruitment to planning and upgrading schools; and (c) a variety of others such as contract centers, industry-related programs, and the regional bodies or compacts. The three regional boards—the Southern Regional Education Board, Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, and the New England Board of Higher Education—are among the most knowledgeable and effective proponents of coordination, and are frequent seeders of consortia. Of more recent development, but moving with increasing effectiveness and efficiency, are the state higher education coordinating bodies. They hold much promise for all of higher education.

There are some who fear any coordinating bodies. They have heard leading educators call for institutional amalgamation. Such organic union may in a few instances be wise. But in most cases similar and sometimes more desirable outcomes can be accomplished without such formal and monolithic structure, which, carried far enough, could have overtones of the cartel. Many of the most fruitful arrangements have no formal agreements whatsoever. These include the CIC multilateral and the MIT-Woods Hole bilaterals. In fact, flexibility was found to be one of the keys to success in cooperation.

There are four common types of interchange: students, staff, facilities, and programs or services, ranging from joint professorships to international centers. There are at least two kinds of initiative: voluntary and legislative, although some legislated arrangements are more voluntary than the voluntary.

Consortia comprehend almost every conceivable geographic combination from contiguous campuses to intrastate, regional, national, and international mechanisms. They involve institutions in all combinations of size and of control—public, private, and church-related, although the private schools tend to lead. The very large public universities tend to be more choosy than others, and the small church-related schools more fearful. Yet there are more than seventy consortia which include public, private, and church institutions. Agreements may be in the form of charter, incorporation, contract, memoranda, or letters or without any formality at all.

The keys to cooperation in higher education stand out strong and clear: First, a strong feeling of need, institutional or societal, which cannot be so well met through other avenues. Second, a deep mutual confidence, especially as concerns integrity and ability in commitment. Third, a knowledgeable and wholehearted desire to cooperate. Fourth, clear and continuing communication at all levels within and between institutions. There are other ingredients, but these four are basic. When fully implemented, success is likely to follow. If not, there will be trouble.

Cooperation is emerging as a major art and obligation among both faculty and administration. It is reaching vertically from kindergarten to postdoctoral programs (intercultural efforts are examples). The sooner this art (or science) is learned by trustee, administration, faculty, and constituent alike, the sooner will our colleges and universities develop new and more stable dimensions of quality and service. There is nothing to fear in cooperation except our own fears, misinformation, and unwillingness to share. It is clearly time for every institution to make a study of all its programs in light of the possibilities of interinstitutional cooperation.

Opportunities and problems for leadership through local and regional consortia

PART
VII
CHAPTER
3

ELMER D. WEST

THE TIME IS PAST when we must present a rationale for inter-university cooperation. We are now thoroughly acquainted with the problems of higher education, and these problems require that we make better use of our personnel and materials. One method of doing so is through the development of associations or consortia of educational institutions.

Parenthetically, these problems also suggest a need for developing more intra-university cooperation. Like charity, perhaps interinstitutional cooperation should begin at home. Many universities today have individual schools or colleges with separate faculty and facilities, registrars and other administrative officers and paraphernalia, and even different academic calendars. Many of the opportunities obtainable through the formation of local consortia and many of the problems are essentially extensions of those found in intra-university cooperation.

The first problem may be in achieving initial agreement as to the purpose or purposes of the consortium. If the top administration cannot agree on, or is not favorable to, the stated purposes of a proposed consortium, it will not be formed; or, if formed, it will function only perfunctorily. The first problem, then, is acceptance by the administration, if only to bring an agreement into existence.

It is in the area of communications that troubles will most often arise. The description of courses in a college catalogue may have some logical relationship to others in the same catalogue; but when these descriptions are spread among many universities, they tend to lack something as a basis for intelligent interaction. Furthermore, courses are dropped or changed or rescheduled, and new ones are added. The task of keeping, in several universities, the various department heads in a given discipline alert to these changes illustrates one problem in a local consortium with cross-registration of students.

Faculty support is of major importance in any attempt to develop cooperative programs within a given discipline. Perhaps the problem is not essentially different from that within a given institution; but when the programs of other universities are potentially open to the student, uncertainties are involved which add to the problem. The conscientious faculty advisor will want to assure himself of the content, coverage, and quality of a course in another university before he permits his advisee to enroll; and the receiving professor will want to be assured of the quality and competence of this student from another academic environment. All the problems of the well-known "we're better than they are" attitude come into play in the initial phases of cooperation. The problem is not eased for a few faculty members by the attitude of some graduate students, one of whom wrote that his advisor was reluctant to let his students take courses in the other universities and then added: "A competent professor need not fear competition." Wisely, he stopped at that, but we can read his message. Professors quite properly must protect their students from incompetent instruction; but they must also be willing to meet intellectual competition. It is a subtle force making for improvement in education, but it may at first be a disrupting one.

Some assurances must be given to the faculty when courses or degree programs should be dropped in order to reduce unnecessary duplication. Or when a director of a center, or a professor, or a department head wants to introduce a new program or series of courses, he may need help in understanding or accepting the total situation. At the time of this writing, one professor wants to introduce Japanese at his university. A survey shows that the courses in Japanese already given in two of the universities are more than adequate, and to add such courses at a third university would be educational and economic nonsense. We must remember that the maximum distance between any two of the universities is under seven miles. Habits of thinking are hard to break; the development of liberal student interchange procedures requires new attitudes.

I sometimes think that the educational process would, from the student's point of view, be considerably enhanced if all barriers to student interchange (i.e., taking courses at other universities) were dropped; but the mere mention of such a possibility would be frightening to many people in education. In the Consortium in Washington, only one of the universities has limited the number of semester hours a student may take through the Consortium, and that, I think, is a carry-over from earlier days. The Administrative Committee of the Consortium has decided not to set a limit, leaving the matter to the discretion of the student's advisor. Incidentally, in general it is the advisor who approves the courses, and who therefore approves what otherwise would be called transfer of credit. We have had, to date, one student in classes in four of the five universities in one semester, and several in as many as three of the universities. Thus an obvious advantage is the broadening of program possibilities for the student.

Although faculty attitudes may present a problem, generally faculty members become cooperative as they become more aware of the possibilities open to their own graduate students, and as they, and the department chairmen, see how they can increase the extent of their own specialization. Essentially, it may be simply that we all tend to fear what we don't understand, and where association leads to understanding, cooperation will follow.

Cooperation within a consortium may result in the development of specialization by schools, by disciplines, by areas within disciplines. It may result in specialization within one institution with complementary courses in others. Because of their proximity, it is quite possible for the five universities in Washington to develop specialization within the totality of a given discipline. Theoretically, for example, one university might specialize in clinical psychology, another in experimental, another in industrial, another in educational, and a fifth in counseling psychology, with programs in each open to students from the other four. Through such specialization, a better total program might be developed.

Unfortunately, however, there are also problems which may have their origin in the attitudes of those who make judgments as, for example, in the awarding of fellowship grants. These attitudes, at times, seem to indicate a lack of comprehension of anything but a balanced program (whatever that may be!) within a single university. To such people the familiar, the conventional, may be of more importance than the development within a university system of integrated, supplemental coordinated programs *for the student.*

There may also be other problems of this type which are posed by regulations which seem to be less than innovative. I have been told that, for example, special grants to libraries cannot be made by the U.S. Office of Education to a consortium; that such grants may be made only to the individual institutions. "Combinations of institutions" is being interpreted with emphasis on institutions, not combinations. Such an interpretation might impose handicaps should centralized operations of a given program be desirable.

There are also administrative problems which require great time and effort, yet have little bearing on the educational process as such. How, for example, does a student register for courses at more than one university? How does he find out about the classes? What can be done about different calendars, different opening dates? Hypothetically, one university opens on September 5, another on September 25. Each is convinced that its entire program would falter if it changed its opening date to September 15. At times it seems almost impossible to convince some people that, once a change is made, there will still be as much time as before to go to Europe, or take another job, or do summer research. Yet changes do occur: one university moved its spring vacation by three weeks to bring it into harmony with the others.

Cooperation in higher education is not new. The history of higher education reveals that many institutions have been merged with others, or absorbed by others, or have worked under a coordinated basis of operation. (I exclude regional compacts which are between states rather than institutions.) What may be new—at least in emphasis—is the growth on the one hand, of state organizations which, in some instances, actually substitute in the name of cooperation a super board of administration, and on the other, of voluntary associations.

In either instance, problems may arise from the fact that too much is expected too soon of cooperation; and that not enough is achieved rapidly enough through cooperation. It takes time—lots of time, patient perseverance, some stubbornness, meetings and meetings and meetings—but the potential payoff is substantial.

PART
VII
CHAPTER
4

Interinstitutional cooperation and the exchange of instructional materials

ERNEST L. BOYER

THIS MOVE TO UNITE higher learning is an interesting turn of events, for what once was a vice has—with remarkable speed—become a virtue. Educators have long worshipped independence, autonomy, and—as the catalogues describe it—"the isolated college on the hill." Now higher educators are insisting they belong together. Indeed, the urge to unite has grown so intense that even Vassar looks longingly toward New Haven and the president of Cornell tells his Princeton friends that all of us are now a part of one vast system. President Perkins, in his lectures on "The University in Transition," speaks approvingly of an interlocking educational network that runs "through the department, through the college, the university, the state, the regional compact, the national association, and the international body." Talk such as this should convince even the most reluctant joiner that, for better or worse, interinstitutional cooperation is here to stay.

The *intensity* of our commitment to collaboration is clear. However, our understanding of just what we *mean* by such commitment remains obscure. Clearly, enthusiasm for togetherness has outdistanced reason, and talk of cooperation has run far ahead of achievement. To illustrate: many of the voluntary associations have brought together clusters of private colleges which have joined forces because of proximity or common academic or fiscal concerns. Initially, when such alliances are formed, there is a burst of good will. Enthusiasm abounds, and one is convinced that the "Amanist spirit" has been reborn and that, just as in the communal colonies of old, all things will be held in common. But time passes, and so does the zeal. The partners remain confused, or intentionally fuzzy, about steps being taken to move them from dream to reality.

State systems, as well, are often elusive. A scattering of autonomous public institutions in a state are brought together to make certain that the use of resources makes fiscal and educational sense. And yet, long after such alliances are bureaucratically decreed, the coordinating councils, or what have you, that oversee the system often are hard-pressed to find ways to make the program work. For such boards it is often most difficult to develop a mosaic that is both acceptable to the colleges and satisfactory to the legislature.

This is the hard reality. As yet we are still very much in the dark about this thing called partnership in education. There is much confusion, and little interest, about the basic question of just how interinstitutional arrangement in higher education *really can* be made to work. We have a vague idea that, for educational reasons, we *should* work together and that, for political reasons, we *must* work together. And yet, how do we move from this vague commitment to a program that actually makes sense? How deep must the commitment be? What kinds of cooperative projects are most practical? Who should be involved in the planning of such projects? How are those who participate in cooperative activity to be rewarded? These perplexities bring me to suggest five ground rules that must be followed if any cooperative effort is to move from talk to action.

First, the commitment to cooperation must be deep. As I see it, all attempts at collaboration will fail unless those who enter the partnership understand just what is at stake. Cooperation is an investment and, like all social contracts, requires that some autonomy be surrendered to a greater good. You cannot talk about the exchange of faculty, about the transfer of credit, about the use of videotaped lectures, or about the building of a common library without facing the fact that all such schemes require *shared planning*. When several institutions are involved, decisions heretofore made locally now must be reached collaboratively.

Several years ago I directed a project that linked a large university with twenty-four surrounding elementary and secondary districts. The goals of the venture were nobly stated and enthusiastically endorsed. All partners agreed to work for greater continuity in the curriculum, new schemes in teacher improvement, and increased interschool use of faculty. After directing the project for three years, I can assure you that in a project of this type there is a great gap between drafting a plan and executing a program. Progress was made only *after* it became clear to all that curriculum improvement meant that curriculum planning had to be carried out *together*, that *cooperatively* developed in-service courses for teachers meant that the wishes of *many* districts must be considered, and that *sharing* faculty among districts called for an *interinstitutional* analysis of faculty loads. Vague commitments yielded to hard realities as the university and each district understood that programs historically developed in isolation now required interinstitutional consideration.

At the heart of this experience is a point worth noting. To enter an alliance does require that the partners give up something. It means that independent institutions surrender isolation for a greater good. It calls for a new way of thinking about how students learn, about where the resources of the colleges should be located, about the role of the professor, and above all about the independence of a single institution. Any college unwilling to re-examine these fundamental issues should never talk of joining with others.

Second, the structure sustaining intercollege cooperation must be appropriate. From my brief view of the scene I am convinced that very little is known about the organizational structure needed to support an interinstitutional program once the compact has been formed. If the system is created by legislative decree, very often a coordinating core is also formed to hold the alliance together. Almost inevitably, though, such legislation is subject to interpretation—indeed, it must be interpreted, inference must be drawn from it, and the permissiveness that should characterize it must be exercised if a workable organization is to emerge. The responsibilities of the new structure must be defined in detail, as must the authority upon which it can draw to help meet its obligations. What are the sources and the extent of its powers? How is it apportioned among the organization's components; and, most particularly, what is the management role of the central coördinating body?

These problems are even more acute and perplexing when voluntary associations are formed. Parenthetically, as a person who has become fairly familiar with the complexities of two mandated associations of educational institutions, I shock myself by asserting that a voluntary association faces even more acute and perplexing problems—and yet I believe it is essentially true.

What ingredients, fitted together in what ways, are needed to launch the new vessel and keep it afloat?

Although each voluntary association must develop a structure to meet its own special needs, I submit several recommendations which in my view are universally valid. First, there must be a top-level board of governors whose powers, purposes, and composition are clearly defined. Campus leaders from each institution must participate actively in determining the shape and direction of the new enterprise.

Second, task forces are needed for each specific project launched by the alliance. The personnel involved will vary from project to project, and those who eventually will be called upon to carry out a project must be involved in its planning.

Third, there should be a coordinator or facilitator or secretary-general (please note that I deliberately avoid such terms as director and executive) who provides the organizational and supportive services. His is a most delicate and demanding role. He and his staff, no less than the governing board, will create the climate. The coordinator must *manage* the affairs of the consortium lest chaos result, but he will *dictate* cooperative efforts only at the risk of stultifying faculty interest and initiative. His is the pivotal position, yet his success can best be measured by how few pivotal actions he is forced to take.

All of this is to make clear that the good will of an alliance is not enough. It must follow a structure, tailored to the special needs of the consortium to support the venture.

Third, the focus of interinstitutional cooperation must be specific and the moves decisive. Once collaboration is agreed to and a structure established, then the partners in the alliance must bring concreteness to the venture. They must take calculated risks, push for approval of pioneering projects, and see to it that the first few programs are properly launched.

Such ventures have a self-escalating quality. Action breeds action. Enterprise sparks enterprise, and even if early efforts are not howling successes, the byproducts cannot be ignored. Cross-fertilization, a breakdown of institutional isolation, and a reciprocity of respect are of immeasurable worth. Most importantly, quick action is called for to ensure that the whole idea is not overtaken by lethargy.

Keep in mind, however, that these decisive early moves must focus on projects that pose little threat to existing structures. They must start at points where the advantages are obvious and conflicts minimal. To illustrate: let's assume that consortium members decide that first they will design a common general education television course for all campuses. The problems are enormous. Local faculties must approve the professor and the content of the course. Displaced professors must be reassigned. The relationship of the piped-in course to the total general education program at each college must be examined. These complex organizational and human problems cannot be solved overnight, and to begin cooperation at this point alone is to court disaster.

On the other hand, consider the prospect of shared libraries or intercampus lectureships among colleges as early moves. These projects enrich each campus, and no basic overhaul of the system is needed. Quick, concrete action is possible. I do not wish to suggest that collaboration even at the outset should be bland. Rather, I propose that early cooperative steps among the colleges must relate to projects that are quickly achievable and clearly beneficial.

Fourth, participation in cooperative planning must be widespread. Any cooperative program, if it is to succeed, must involve in the planning those who will be called upon to carry on the work. As things now stand, consortia planning often brings together either top brass or technicians. These officials draft proposals in isolation, and yet these joint schemes ultimately call for a commitment from a host of other people all up and down the line. Key people frequently do not hear of the project until action is called for. Some time back I attended an intercampus session in which a group of presidents talked enthusiastically of working together. They committed their institutions in principle to a whole range of ventures related to curriculum, to teaching, and to library acquisitions. While this initial high-level commitment was noble and necessary, the presidents also agreed that they themselves would continue to serve as the planning board for the consortium. There was no hint that others would be brought into the planning or that help would be sought to tackle the myriad of details. More importantly, there was no talk of ways by which members of the faculty and staff would develop their own dedication to the scheme.

Soon thereafter I attended a second cooperation conference. Here the intercampus talk was carried on by technicians. The planning had to do with an intercollege information storage and retrieval system. Those attending the conference knew how to install cables and link computers but, so far as I could tell, they had no power to decide what should be shared or what the relationship of the proposed network would be to educational programs back home. There was no evidence that the deans, or the professors, or the students, or even the librarians from the colleges had ever been asked what they would like to share or how such sharing could become a powerful part of the instruction on campus.

My fifth and final point is that the rewards for intercollege cooperation must be real. This brings me to the most delicate issue of all—the matter of money and honor. I submit that we cannot call upon faculty to give time to programs that extend beyond their own campus without rewarding them for the effort.

As things now stand, professors usually are rewarded for activities carried on in isolation, for projects and research that focus on the career rather than the institution. More often than not, professional payoff—in the form of salaries and tenure and promotion in rank—comes to those who give themselves single-mindedly to their own discipline, and surrender fully to their specialty. Anyone who looks at larger problems of the college, or works with colleagues from other colleges, does so at his own risk. Professors who take time to develop cooperative courses or plan joint seminars, or indexes for a new library system, or prepare to lecture often risk professional isolation. Such detours may prove fatal.

Members of the teaching faculty must be involved in interinstitutional cooperation. Indeed, many are eager to join in the effort. If clusters of colleges agree to work together, they also must agree that those who leave their routine commitments to make the cooperative project work will be rewarded. They must declare that such efforts will be given the highest priority and that those who participate will be fully honored when salaries are raised, promotions are made, and tenure is awarded.

Containing the information explosion

PART VII CHAPTER 5

HAROLD A. HASWELL

ACHIEVING BUCK ROGERS REALISM is no longer the monopoly of the space scientist; the spectacular and the unbelievable have begun to pervade the educational community as well. It is still true that East is East and West is West, but now the twain *do* meet.

Let us imagine that Bill and Joe are both products of the same Midwestern graduate school. After completing their training, one goes East and the other West. One fall afternoon, fifteen minutes before Joe is to step in front of his Ivy League undergraduates, he suddenly remembers an excellent illustration Bill had used in one of their graduate seminars. It is just what he needs to climax his presentation. He picks up the telephone, and in a minute is talking to Bill on his Pacific campus. "Do you have that illustration handy?" "Sure thing, just a minute." In a matter of minutes Bill retrieves the desired information, places it on his telephone transmitting device, and Joe receives an exact facsimile copy—via telephone—3,000 miles away. Impossible? Not at all—Xerox has already perfected the technique. Instantaneous transmission over the airwaves is with us to stay.

Equally startling developments are realities in the field of film storage and reproduction of printed materials. The National Cash Register Company has perfected the art of microphotography to a point where they are able to store the entire contents of the Encyclopaedia Britannica on a single 4 x 6 inch film sheet which can be sold for a dollar, and which can be read as easily as standard 35mm film.

Another firm has found a way to store printed matter in three dimensions. Not long ago they demonstrated the technique on a nationwide television program. Numerous pictures were photographed one on top of the other by intentionally double exposing the film over and over again. Through the use of a special reader, each image can be retrieved and reproduced on a screen without losing detail or disturbing other images on the film. Using this technique, the researchers have stored up to 435 separate pictures on a single negative.

These are but a few of the examples which hint at the revolution moving in on the educational community—a revolution as dramatic and significant as the invention of the printing press. Educators must inform themselves of these changes and prepare to take maximum advantage of each new development.

Much has been written about the information explosion of our day. It has been estimated that man's cumulative knowledge is more than doubling each decade. While it is difficult, if not impossible, to measure the total volume of "new" information, it is certainly easy to cite evidences of its existence.

Three months ago I had occasion to determine the number of major *educational* journals published in English in the United States and Canada. I was surprised to learn that that list contained 635 separate publications and was growing weekly. New books are coming from the publishers at an ever-increasing rate. Unpublished documents, such as administrative reports, evaluative studies, professional papers, conference reports, addresses, and informal research notes are filling to capacity already bulging files.

Someone has well said that it is no longer possible for any specialist, regardless of how narrowly he defines his area of interest, to keep abreast of all that is being written and said on his subject.

To cope with current-day information problems, a person must cooperate with his colleagues and rely more completely than ever upon the documentation efforts of the information scientist, if he is even to sample the more promising innovations in his field.

Fortunately, developments in the field of documentation have paralleled the growth of information. The computer has been harnessed to help solve the problems of storing and retrieving information, with remarkable results. Photography has entered not only the area of information storage, but the realm of printing as well. Results heretofore unthought of have been achieved in lowering the cost of reproduction, reducing the space required for storing information, and eliminating the time lag between the completion of a document and the diffusion of its contents to the educational community.

Most of these achievements have taken place within the past decade, and have been applied to education within the past three to five years. During this period a rash of information centers or clearinghouses has swept the educational community.

The most ambitious information effort is a cooperative arrangement between selected educational organizations and the U.S. Office of Education. The objective is to establish a nationwide network of decentralized clearinghouses with a centralized dissemination and indexing system. To accomplish these goals, the USOE created the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) in May 1964. Currently there are twelve specialized clearinghouses feeding information into the system. Central ERIC, located in the USOE, is both an administrative unit and a clearinghouse for USOE-funded research. Six to eight new centers will be added within the next three months.

Each clearinghouse seeks out the relevant literature in its own field of specialization, i.e. reading, science education, counseling and guidance, etc. The professional staff at each center reviews the documents for relevance, quality, and significance to those working in the field of their specialization. Quality documents are abstracted, indexed, and catalogued. Finally, the information relating to each document is summarized on a one-page résumé and forwarded to a computer center serving the entire system. A punch paper tape record of the document résumé is edited and stored on magnetic tape. On a monthly basis the computer prepares cross-reference indexes and camera-ready copy from which an announcement bulletin is printed.

Users of the system can obtain the twelve issues of the ERIC index bulletin, *Research in Education*, from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, for $1 per issue or $11 per year. Each calendar year a cumulative index will be prepared by merging the monthly publications. As the ERIC file grows, the collection should become an invaluable resource for instructional faculty and research personnel alike.

The ERIC system is an effort to link dissemination of information to a bibliographic and indexing service. To accomplish this goal, the USOE has created the ERIC Document Reproduction Service at Cleveland through a contract with the Bell & Howell Company. A copy of each document entering the system, unless there is a copyright restriction which cannot be resolved, is sent to Cleveland. Under the Bell & Howell contract, each document is filmed in full text on microfiche. (Microfiche is a 4 x 6 inch sheet of film on which may be stored up to seventy pages of information. The bibliographic citation is filmed in eye-readable print.) The master negative is retained in the film vaults of the company, and only duplicates are circulated to users of the ERIC system. Any individual can purchase copies of ERIC documents by writing Bell & Howell and supplying the document number.

Most college and university libraries will find it advantageous to maintain a master microfiche file of all ERIC documents. Such a collection would be especially valuable if the institution offers graduate credit in the substantive fields covered by ERIC clearinghouses. Roughly 70 percent is uncopyrighted and unpublished material. Faculty members will also find the ERIC file an invaluable reference resource for basic, applied, and institutional research. Department chairmen and members of curriculum committees can rely on the ERIC file to keep them cognizant of innovations in areas of their special interest.

Indeed, the whole purpose of ERIC is to accelerate communication throughout the educational community. Thus, the system is tailor-made to further the exchange of instructional materials in printed form. However, the system will only be as effective as educators make it. Educators are the producers of information as well as the users. Unless they take the initiative to see that good documents find their way to the appropriate clearinghouse, the whole system will break down. The network is created, and will be maintained, to serve them. They should use it—both as *producers* and *consumers.*

I would like to conclude by suggesting some ways in which institutions can make maximum use of an information system. Master files of all ERIC microfiche will be maintained at the Regional Educational Laboratories established by the U.S. Office of Education. Occasional users of the system will find these facilities, backed up by the national distribution service operated by Bell & Howell, adequate to meet their needs. However, heavy users may wish to have a service center more readily available. Such centers could be established under a cooperative arrangement or by individual institutions.

A typical service center could well develop along the following lines. Funding could be shared on a pro-rata basis. The original investment should include funds for personnel, equipment and supplies, and the master microfiche file. One or two good secretaries should be able to operate a reasonably large service center. The basic equipment and approximate cost needed to support such a center might consist of the following items: two or three portable microfiche readers @ $100 to $200 each; one reader-printer @ $750 to $2,500 (prices vary depending upon the degree of automation desired); one machine capable of producing a paper mat, such as the 3M A09 System, or the Xerox 914 or 2400 (such equipment can be rented by the month and the cost varies depending upon use—a beginning budget figure of $100 per month is a minimum estimate); one unit of offset printing equipment, such as an addressograph (3M's A09 System has a small speed-print unit built into the system—again, such equipment could be rented for roughly $100 per month); one low-capacity machine capable of producing duplicate microfiche, such as that marketed by Kalvar Corporation, CBS Laboratories, or Atlantic Microfilm Corporation (purchase price ranges from $200 to $1,000).

Such a service center should be able to receive requests for specific ERIC documents by document number and fill the order by return mail, providing the user with either duplicate microfiche or hard copy. The service could be free to member institutions or a small service charge could be assessed, depending upon the budget arrangement under which the center was operating.

The day is not too distant when ERIC users will have access to 100,000 indexed documents. The collection will consist largely of unpublished research reports, both government-sponsored and privately supported; administrative reports; instructional materials; evaluative studies; and journal articles. The entire historical file on research sponsored by the Office of Education since 1956 will be in the system by September. It is expected that the ERIC collection will grow at the rate of 10,000 to 15,000 documents a year and will eventually cover all aspects of education.

As the collection grows, search capabilities will of necessity need to be further automated. Institutions and service centers may wish to purchase duplicate copies of the updated master computer tapes and develop their own program to produce selected bibliographies by using coordinates chosen from the ERIC Thesaurus of Educational Terms. This possibility offers another fruitful area for further interinstitutional cooperation.

Contributing Authors

Adolph G. Anderson, Dean, New College, Hofstra University

Stephen K. Bailey, Dean, Maxwell School, Syracuse University

John E. Bebout, Director, Urban Study Center, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey

Ernest L. Boyer, Vice Chancellor for University-Wide Activities, State University of New York at Albany

Launor F. Carter, Senior Vice President, System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California

Douglass Cater, Special Assistant to President Johnson

Russell M. Cooper, Dean, Liberal Arts College, University of South Florida

Edgar Dale, Professor of Education, Ohio State University

Alfred D. Donovan, Vice President in Charge of Student Personnel Services, Seton Hall University

Edward D. Eddy, President, Chatham College

Clifford G. Erickson, President, Rock Valley College

David Fellman, Vilas Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin

Robert S. Fogarty, Professor of American Thought and Language, Michigan State University

Charles E. Ford, Director of Research, NCEA Study of Catholic Higher Education, Saint Louis University

Roger H. Garrison, Staff Associate for Faculty, American Association of Junior Colleges

Jack R. Gibb, Resident Fellow, Western Behavioral Sciences Institute

Samuel B. Gould, Chancellor, State University of New York

Harold A. Haswell, Educational Research Advisor, U.S. Office of Education

Algo D. Henderson, Visiting Research Educator, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley

Ralph D. Hetzel, Vice President, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., and Member, Board of Trustees, Pennsylvania State University

Conrad Hilberry, Associate Director, Study of the Future of Liberal Arts Colleges, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Forest G. Hill, Professor of Economics, University of Texas

Robert W. Iversen, Professor of Social Science, Maxwell School, Syracuse University

Mary Dublin Keyserling, Director, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor

Harold J. Leavitt, Walter Kenneth Kilpatrick Professor of Organizational Behavior and Psychology, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University

Roland Liebert, Graduate Teaching Assistant, University of Wisconsin

Ronald Lippitt, Professor of Sociology and Psychology, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

Louis Long, Professor and Chairman, Department of Student Services, City College of New York

Warren Bryan Martin, Research Educator, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley

John W. McConnell, President, University of New Hampshire

Robert Menke, Member, Board of Trustees, Indiana University

Paul A. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Raymond S. Moore, United States Educational Representative-Elect to UNESCO, Paris, jointly for the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Frederic W. Ness, President, Fresno State College

Manning M. Pattillo, Associate Director, The Danforth Foundation

Samuel N. Postlethwait, Professor of Biology, Purdue University

Albert H. Quie, Representative, First District of Minnesota, U.S. House of Representatives

James W. Reynolds, Professor and Consultant in Junior College Education, University of Texas

Richard C. Richardson, Jr., President, Northhampton County Community College (Pennsylvania)

Nevitt Sanford, Director, Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University

Paul H. Sherry, Secretary, Division of Higher Education, Board for Homeland Ministries, United Church of Christ

Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr., Director, Commission on Academic Affairs, American Council on Education

Stephen H. Spurr, Dean, Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, University of Michigan

Charles E. Stearns, Acting Provost, Tufts University

Martin Tarcher, Chief Consultant, Social and Health Sciences, Continuing Education, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco

Barbara W. Tuchman, Author

Jesse M. Unruh, Speaker, California Assembly

Miller Upton, President, Beloit College

Philip Werdell, Editor, *Moderator* magazine

Elmer D. West, Executive Director, Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area

E. G. Williamson, Dean of Students and Professor of Psychology, University of Minnesota

Henry T. Yost, Jr., Professor of Biology, Amherst College

AAHE Officers and Executive Committee

Stephen J. Wright, president, United Negro College Fund, *president*

Lewis B. Mayhew, professor of education, Stanford University, *vice president (president-elect)*

Frank C. Abbott, executive director, Colorado Commission on Higher Education

G. Lester Anderson, Distinguished Service Professor of Higher Education, State University of New York at Buffalo

C. Ray Carpenter, research professor of psychology and anthropology, Pennsylvania State University

Joseph P. Cosand, president, The Junior College District of St. Louis—St. Louis County

Lawrence E. Dennis, education program advisor, The Ford Foundation (Venezuela)

Charles F. Donovan, S.J., academic vice president, Boston College

Melvene D. Hardee, professor of higher education, Florida State University

C. Addison Hickman, Vandeveer Professor of Economics, Southern Illinois University

Robert J. Keller, dean, College of Education, University of Minnesota

Sister Mary Ignatia Griffin, B.V.M., dean, Mundelein College

G. Kerry Smith, *executive secretary*
Richard P. Saunders, *associate executive secretary*
Anne C. Yates, *administrative assistant*

AAHE Conference Planning Committee

Randall M. Whaley, chancellor, University of Missouri, Kansas City, *chairman*

Sanford S. Atwood, president, Emory University

C. Ray Carpenter, research professor of psychology and anthropology, Pennsylvania State University (Executive Committee liaison)

James I. Doi, professor of higher education, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan

Mervin B. Freedman, chairman, Department of Psychology, San Francisco State College

LeRoy V. Good, president, Monroe Community College

Abraham Holtzman, professor of history and political science, North Carolina State University at Raleigh

Morris T. Keeton, academic vice president, Antioch College

Robert H. Shaffer, dean of students, Indiana University

Index

Academic freedom, 24, 30, 155, 211
Academic Procession, 153
Admissions policy, 31
Adult education, 220
Affluence, 19, 264
Agency for International Development, 205
Aiken, Henry, 152
Alienation, 13, 55, 269
American Association for Higher Education, 41, 95
American Association of University Professors, 24, 25, 41, 121, 228, 242, 244
American College, The, 10
American Council on Education, 41, 95, 144
American Economics Association, 265
American Education Placement Center, 167
American Individualism, 273
American Psychological Association, 17
American Student, The, 184
American University, 274
Amherst College, 21, 275
Anderson, Adolph G., 215
Antileadcrship Vaccine, The, 154, 236
Antioch College, 91, 93, 134
Antipoverty program, 209
Argonne National Laboratories, 93
Arnold, Thomas, 154
Associated Colleges of the Midwest, The, 93
Association of American Colleges, 41
Association of American Universities, 41
Association of State Colleges and Universities, 41
Atlantic Microfilm Corporation, 289
Austin, C. Grey, 251
Authors League, The, 7
Autocracy in higher education, 39, 55, 58, 73, 78, 83, 92, 196, 241
Automation, 55, 131

Bailey, Stephen K., 41
Barnard College, 221
Barzun, Jacques, 215
Bebout, John E., 207
Becker, Bishop Thomas A., 162
Behavioral science, 55, 57, 70
Bell, Daniel, 148
Bell & Howell Company, 288
Beloit College, 142
Benezet, Louis, 128
Bing, Rudolph, 8
Biology, 21
Black Lamb and Grey Falcon, 151
Bloom, Benjamin, 89
Bottomley, Horatio, 3
Boulding, Kenneth, 265
Bowers, Fredson, 106
Bowles, Frank, 146
Boyer, Ernest L., 281
Bradbury, Ray, 152
Brecht, Bertolt, 21
Brown University, 35
Bureaucracy, 11, 12, 19, 83
Business education, 67, 70

Calendars, university, 279
California, State of, 29
California, University of, 6, 15, 16, 18, 29, 106, 119, 149, 176, 190, 211, 221
California at Los Angeles, University of, 256
Cambridge, University of, 108
Candidate's degree, 106
Carnegie Corporation, 89
Carter, Launor F., 253
Cartter, Allan, 144, 145
Cater, Douglass, 35
Center for Educational Cooperation, 166
Central Intelligence Agency, 6, 12, 21, 191
Cheating, 22, 90
Chicago Public Schools, 93
Chicago, University of, 106
China, 68
Church-related colleges (*See* Religious education)
City University of New York, 119
Cluster colleges, 281
Cohen, Wilbur, 35
College Center of the Finger Lakes, 275
Colorado College, 233

Colorado University, 185
Columbia Broadcasting System Laboratories, 289
Columbia University, 35, 274
Committee on Institutional Cooperation, 106
Communication, 16, 29, 47, 58, 61, 68, 73, 92, 121, 148, 214, 216, 236, 238, 252
Complacency in education, 233
Computers, 253
Comstock, Anthony, 7
Conant, James B., 43, 89
Conditions of work, 233
Conformity, 79
Congregation of the Holy Cross, 137
Congress, 3, 35, 41, 46
Connally, Tom, 33
Connecticut Valley Consortium, 275
Conservative Looks at Cooperatives, A, 273
Consortia in education, 10, 93, 126, 272, 275, 277
Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area, 278
Consultants, 76
Cooper, Russell M., 232
Cooperative College Teacher Development Program, 233
Cornell University, 38, 84, 281
Corporations, 69, 72
Corson, John J., 83, 157
Cosand, Joseph P., 227
Counseling, 19, 151, 188, 191
Course and Teacher Evaluation, 184
Cowley, W. H., 157
Cranberg, Lawrence, 22
Creative authoritism, 99
Creativity, 56
Curricular change, 74, 101
Cuttington College, 93

Dale, Edgar, 88
Danforth Foundation, 233, 235
Danish, Paul, 184
Dartmouth College, 254
Davis, Paul H., 157
Degrees, new, 106, 145
deKiewiet, C. W., 157
Department chairman, 240, 244
Department of Defense, 37
deSade, Marquis, 7
Dewey, John, 43, 263
Disadvantaged, 31
Donovan, Alfred D., 135
Dreiser, Theodore, 7
Dressel, Paul L., 90
Drew University, 274
Duke University, 274, 275

Eastern Michigan College, 184
Eddy, Edward D., 195, 235
Educational Testing Service, 255
Elementary education, 61, 94, 99, 168, 282
Ellis, John Tracy, 162
Elmhurst College, 142
Encyclopaedia Britannica, 286
Engineering education, 70
Entrepreneurs, 67
ERIC, 287
Erickson, Clifford G., 249
Eros Magazine, 7
Essays in the Public Philosophy, 160
Establishment, The, 22, 88, 178
Ethics in higher education, 21
Evaluation of teachers, 118, 182, 234
Evans, Bergen, 49
Evans, Daniel J., 33
Examinations, 90
Exchange programs, 169
Expediency, 67
Experimental colleges, 215

Faculty, autonomy of, 79
Faculty control of higher education, 175
Faculty development programs, 232, 267
Faculty loads, 217, 230
Faculty orientation, 144, 250
Faculty rank, 250
Faculty recruitment, 144, 249
Faculty, role of the, 18, 92, 151, 213
Faculty, shortage of, 144
Faculty unrest, 60
Fahrenheit 451, 152
Farnsworth, Dana, 5
Fear, 57
Federal control of education, 23
Federal policies, 41
Federal support of education, 43
Feingold, Sam, 257
Fellman, David, 240
Fiedler, Leslie, 149
Financial support of education, 224
Fogarty, Robert S., 148
Ford, Charles E., 162

Fordham University, 138
Foundations, 11
Franconia College, 184
Frank, Lawrence, 12
Frankel, Charles, 35
Franklin and Marshall College, 139
Free Speech Movement, 30
Free universities, 178, 187
Freud, Sigmund, 4
Frye, Chuck, 257
Fund for the Advancement of Education, 102

Galbraith, John K., 265
Galileo, 21
Gardner, John, 4, 35, 39, 48, 52, 98, 100, 113, 154, 184, 205, 215, 216, 236, 237
Garfield, James A., 41
Garrison, Roger H., 227
General education, 226
General Education: Explorations in Evaluation, 90
General Electric Corporation, 69, 73
General Motors Corporation, 73
George Washington University, 221
Gibb, Jack R., 55
Ginzburg, Ralph, 7
Gould, Samuel B., 125
Graduate education, 106, 147, 232
Great Lakes Colleges Association, 93, 95, 275
Great Society, 208
Greece, 73
Gregg, Alan, 12
Groton School, 160
Grew, Nehemiah, 110
Guide to Graduate Study, 147
Gustafson, James M., 158

Harvard University, 5, 19, 88, 119, 149, 176
Haswell, Harold A., 286
Haworth, Leland, 35
Hefner, Hugh, 149
Henderson, Algo D., 78
Hetzel, Ralph D., 211
Heyns, Roger, 29
Higher Education Facilities Act, 36, 227
Hilberry, Conrad, 92
Hill, Forest G., 236
Hoffer, Eric, 125
Hofstra University, 215
Hollywood, 74
Hook, Sidney, 89
Hoover, Herbert, 272
Hornig, Don, 35
House at Pooh Corner, The, 148
House of Commons, 3
Howe, Harold, 35, 46
Humaneness, 56
Humanism, 184
Humphrey, Hubert, 32, 35, 42
Hutchins, Robert M., 17, 133, 195
Hutchinson, E. M., 270

Ideology and Utopia, 152
Illinois College, 142
Illinois, University of, 89
Independent study, 90, 113, 204
Indiana University, 154, 155
Individualism, Old and New, 263
Information explosion, 70, 286
Innovation in education, 88, 110
Institutional cooperation, 155, 235, 272, 277, 281
Instructional improvements, 225
Interdisciplinary study, 182
International Business Machines Corporation, 69, 259
International education, 134, 166, 201, 207
International Education Act, 166
Internships, 197
Iowa, University of, 275
Iversen, Robert W., 201

Jacksonian democracy, 42
James, William, 43
Jefferson, Thomas, 186
John Carroll University, 138
Johnson, Lyndon B., 35, 37, 166, 219
Johnson, Pamela Hansford, 7
Journal of Higher Education, 90, 251
Junior colleges, 125, 223, 227, 244, 249

Kalvar Corporation, 289
Keeney, Barnaby, 35
Keeton, Morris, 95
Keniston, Kenneth, 151
Kennedy, John F., 18, 203
Keppel, Francis, 46
Kerr, Clark, 6, 29, 30, 31, 39
Keynes, John Maynard, 43
Keyserling, Mary Dublin, 218
Knowledge explosion (*See* Information explosion)
Knowles, Warren P., 33

Land-grant colleges and universities, 208
Leadership and the Power of Ideas, 270
Leadership, lack of, 3, 11, 15, 20, 29, 34, 92, 186, 189, 209, 228
Leadership, types of, 10, 34, 41, 46, 55, 57, 67, 74, 78, 83, 96, 101, 127, 135, 139, 164, 173, 186, 189, 211, 215, 228, 234, 236, 240, 263
Learning theory, 111, 269
Leavitt, Harold, 67
Legislators, 154
Leisure, 130
LeVander, Harold, 33
Lewin, Kurt, 19, 75
Liberal education, 11, 92, 141, 159, 182, 215, 216, 228, 232
Libraries, 254
Liebert, Roland, 189
Lincoln Center, 7
Lippitt, Ronald, 96
Lippmann, Walter, 160
Lobbies, 41
London, University of, 108
Long, Louis, 118
Loyalty, 84
Loyola University, 138

Madison Avenue, 74
Mannheim, Karl, 152
Martin, Warren Bryan, 173
Maslow, Abraham, 17
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 35
Massachusetts, University of, 275
Master of Arts in College Teaching, 109
Master of Philosophy degree, 108
Master's degree, 107
Maul, Ray, 145
Mayhew, Lewis B., 90
McCall, Tom, 33
McConnell, John W., 83
McGuire, Christine, 89
McLuhan, Marshall, 151
McNamara, Robert S., 35
Media in education, 68, 88, 90, 96, 112, 133, 147, 155, 169, 217, 286
Medieval university, 178
Menke, Robert, 153
Miami, University of, 275
Michigan State University, 21
Michigan, University of, 35, 90, 106, 221
Microfiche, 288
Middlebrook, Samuel, 121
Miller, Paul, 35, 166
Miller, Raymond, 273
Millett, John, 157
Milne, A. A., 148
Minh, Ho Chi, 30
Minnesota, 46
Minnesota, University of, 221, 275
Monmouth College, 275
Moore, Raymond S., 272
Moral standards, 3, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 67, 74, 110, 174
More, Sir Thomas, 149
Mount Holyoke College, 275
Mumford, Lewis, 148, 150, 152
Murray, Harry, 19

Nation, The, 7
National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 37, 40, 42
National Association of School Superintendents, 41
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 41, 83
National Bureau of Education, 41
National Cash Register Company, 286
National Center for Atmospheric Research, 275
National Defense Education Act, 227
National Education Association, 24, 96
National Humanities Foundation, 43
National Institutes of Health, 37
National Science Foundation, 35, 37, 42, 233, 253, 257
Nebraska, 233
Nebraska Wesleyan, 275
Negotiation in higher education, 29, 79
Ness, Frederic W., 144
Newberry Library, 93
New College, 142
Newcomb, Theodore, 91
New England Board of Higher Education, 275
New Left, The, 79
New York Times, 73
New Yorker, 92
North Central Association, 95, 235
North Texas State University, 275
Northwestern University, 106
Notre Dame University, 136

Ohio University, 273
On Iniquity, 7
Oregon, University of, 83
Orlans, Harold, 43

Palmerston, Lord, 5
Parsons College, 69
Pasteur Institute, 30
Patrick, Luther, 49
Pattillo, Manning M., 158
Peace Corps, 69, 149, 184, 201
Pennsylvania State University, The, 213
Pennsylvania, University of, 23
Perkins, James, 38, 84, 281
Ph.D. degree, 106
Physical Science Study Committee, 88
Physics Today, 22
Picketing, 32
Planning as a leadership process, 96
Portland, University of, 137
Postlethwait, Samuel N., 110
Powell, Adam Clayton, 3, 12
Preparation of teachers, 106
President, role of the, 11, 13, 16, 20, 30, 57, 67, 84, 94, 102, 127, 160, 195, 238
Pressures on higher education, 208
Princeton University, 35, 84, 157, 281
Private support of higher education, 137, 163
Programed education, 68
Programing Language for Interactive Teaching (PLANIT), 257
Project Camelot, 22
Proliferation of courses, 279
Promotion policies, 114
Psychology, 70
Public control of universities, 211
Public Health Service, The, 42
Public relations, 14, 56, 59, 61, 150, 154, 195
Public service in higher education, 37
Public support of higher education, 31, 35, 46
Public Television Corporation, 38
Publish or perish, 145

Quie, Albert H., 46

Radcliffe College, 221
Reagan, Ronald, 30, 31, 32, 33
Recruiting college teachers, 251
Reed, Czar, 5
Regents (*See* Trustees)
Regional Educational Laboratories, 36, 259, 288
Registration problems, 279
Reinert, S.J., Very Rev. Paul J., 162
Religious education, 135, 139, 158, 162
Reporter, The, 35
Research, 10, 13, 16, 19, 23, 36, 56, 75, 97, 266
Responsibility in education, 44, 57
Reynolds, James W., 223
Richardson, Richard C., Jr., 244
Riesman, David, 148, 152
Rigidity in education, 12, 40, 61, 73, 89, 132, 182
Ripley, S. Dillon, 35
Rochester, University of, 157
Rockefeller, Nelson, 33
Romney, George, 33
Roosevelt, Theodore, 34
Rosser, J. Barkeley, 254
Rossman, Mike, 184
Rusk, Dean, 35
Rutgers University, 275

Saint Louis Junior College District, 227
Saint Louis, University of, 138
Saint Paul's Academy, 160
Salaries, 19, 76, 114, 250, 285
Salisbury, Lord, 5
Sanford, Nevitt, 10
Sarah Lawrence College, 216, 221
Savio, Mario, 33
Scholarships, 31, 229
Schultz, Theodore, 43
Secondary education, 168, 227, 245, 282
Senates, university, 84, 213, 236
Seton Hall University, 138
Sherry, Paul H., 139
Shoben, Edward J., Jr., 178
Silberman, Harry, 255
Smith College, 275
Smithsonian Institution, 274
Social sciences, 44, 69
Southern Regional Education Board, 275
Southwest Texas State Teachers College, 35
Specialization in education, 159
Sproul Hall, 29, 33
Spurr, Stephen H., 106

Stanford University, 10, 15, 16, 32, 67, 157, 176
State University of New York, 31
Stearns, Charles E., 114
Stevenson, Adlai, 46
Stokes, Harold, 83
Story of Utopias, The, 148
Strikes, 29, 57, 79, 228
Student, the, 16, 18, 186, 189
Student discipline, 32
Student evaluation of higher education, 173
Student government, 80, 84, 175, 186, 192
Student Government Bulletin, 184
Student-initiated courses, 178
Student participation in higher education, 173
Student, role of, 182
Student unrest, 6, 10, 14, 15, 57, 60, 70, 74, 128, 150, 190, 195
Student values, 182
Sussex, University of, 176
Syracuse University, 41, 275
System Development Corporation, 253
Szent-Györgi, Albert, 215

Tampa Bay Teaching Project, 235
Tarcher, Martin, 263
Taste, 5
Taxes for higher education, 32
Teaching, recognition of, 10
Teaching, types of, 229
Tead, Ordway, 154
Technology in education, 19, 20, 55, 56, 68, 149, 225, 229, 253
Teller, Edward, 149
Temper of Our Time, The, 125
Tennessee, University of, 108
Tenure, 114
Texas Women's University, 275
Theobald, Robert, 265
Toronto, University of, 108
Trust, 58
Trustees, 31, 135, 139, 153, 211, 224
Trustees, Teachers, Students, 154
Tuchman, Barbara W., 3
Tuition, 31, 226
Tutorials, 176
Tyler, Ralph, 91

Uncommitted, The, 151
Unions, 79, 85
United Church of Christ, 142
United Nations, 274
U. S. Government Printing Office, 288
U. S. National Student Association, 184, 189
U. S. Office of Education, 36, 41, 42, 272, 279
University governance, 78
Unruh, Jesse M., 29
Upton, Miller, 101
Urban education, 34, 133, 155, 207, 269
Utopia, 148, 149

Values, 17, 20
Vassar College, 281
Vatican Council, Second, 137, 161, 164
Vonnegut, Kurt, 152

War, 56, 74
Washington Semester, The, 274
Weaver, Robert, 35
Webb, James, 40
Wells, Herman, 154
Werdell, Philip R., 182
West, Elmer D., 277
West, Rebecca, 151
Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 275
Westinghouse Corporation, 69
West Virginia, University of, 35
Whitehead, Alfred North, 43, 229
Williamson, E. G., 186
Wilson, Logan, 36
Wilson, Woodrow, 37, 40
Wirtz, Willard, 35
Wisconsin, University of, 221, 275
Women, education of, 218
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, 274
World peace, 132
Wriston, Henry, 153

Xerox Corporation, 286

Yale University, 35, 119, 158
Yost, Henry T., Jr., 21